

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XII

MAY, 1941

No. 5

The Christian's Attitude towards His Government and on War

Essay read at the New York District Pastoral Conference assembled
in St. Mark's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., December 3, 1940

I

Civil government is ordained of God for the establishment of justice, the protection of life and property, and the maintenance of law and order in human society. Rom. 13:1-7; 1 Pet. 2:13, 14; Titus 3:1; 1 Tim. 2:1-3. Article 16 of Augustana and Apology.

The *sedes doctrinae* for the doctrine of civil government is Rom. 13:1-7. Literally translated: "Let every soul (*pasa psyche*) be subject to the superior powers." The plural, *exousiai*, is used, denoting not merely government in the abstract but *in concreto*, the persons as bearers of the divine office. In Titus 3:1 we have the same plural, "principalities and powers." Officers of the government are also designated as "Caesar," Matt. 22:21, and as "the king as supreme and governors," 1 Pet. 2:14.

Dr. A. L. Graebner, in *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 3: "The apostle describes governments as *exousiai* and *hyperechousai*, powers and superior powers. It is essential for a government to be a power, and a superior power, in order to be able to fulfil its purpose. For only a superior power can assert itself to all evil-doers and afford protection to all of its subjects and defend their rights, not only in its own territory but also against foreign powers and their subjects."

"There is no power but of God." Literally, nor is there power except of God. Dr. Stoeckhardt: "The thought is: There would be no government, government would not be possible nor conceivable, if it did not come from God. No power on earth could in any measure check and control the wickedness and injustice of men, as

described in Rom. 1, if the strong arm of God were not behind the government." (*Roemerbrief*, p. 579.) John 19:11 Jesus said to Pontius Pilate: "Thou couldest have no power against Me at all except it were given thee from above." "The powers that be are ordained of God." It is plainly stated here that all governments are instituted of God. This is not contradicted by 1 Pet. 2:13: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man," because the words immediately follow "for the Lord's sake." It makes no difference in what way the government came into power, whether by inheritance or by free election or by bloody revolution; that government which is in power, which maintains itself by force, that government is ordained of God. The deciding factor is *to einai*, the powers that be. In this case might is right. The government *de facto* is also the government *de iure*. Neither does the form of government matter, whether it be unchecked despotism, as was the case when Paul wrote these words, Nero being on the throne, which was a pure autocracy, or a monarchy or a republic. Neither does it matter whether the authorities rule according to Christian principles or heathen or atheistic principles, as is the case in the Soviet Union today. Neither does it matter whether the higher powers are just and equitable in administration or tyrannical. 1 Pet. 2:18 the apostle exhorts servants to obey also the "froward masters" (*skolioi*), crooked, unfair, which applies also to government. We must distinguish between persons and office; the person may be a scoundrel, but the office is divine.

In Rom. 13 the apostle has established the divine right and the divine dignity of civil government. That appears also from the titles which God in the Bible bestows upon officers of the government. V.4: "ministers of God." Joseph in Egypt said: "God hath made me a father to Pharaoh and a ruler throughout all the land of Egypt," Gen. 48:8. The Romans called their governmental officers *patres patriae*. George Washington is known as the "Father of his Country." We speak of "city fathers," referring to local government. The authority of government is vested in the Fourth Commandment. Luther says in his Large Catechism: "All authority flows from the authority of parents." Again: "We have two kinds of fathers presented in this commandment, fathers in blood and fathers in office." They are called "gods." Ex. 22:28: "Thou shalt not revile the gods nor curse the rulers of thy people." Ps. 82:1, 6. "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the gods." "I have said: Ye are gods." They are called "saviors" or "deliverers." Judg. 3:9: "The Lord raised a deliverer to the children of Israel, . . . even Othniel." They are called "anointed of the Lord." 1 Sam. 24:6: David said: "The Lord forbid that I should do this thing unto my master, the Lord's

anointed." "Nursing fathers." Is. 49:23: "And kings shall be thy nursing fathers and their queens thy nursing mothers." "Shields." Ps. 47:9: "The princes of the people are gathered together, even the people of the God of Abraham. For the shields of the earth belong unto God."

Object of government. What is stated in Thesis I as the purpose of the institution of government is found v. 4: "He is the minister of God to thee for good," for your benefit and for your protection against evil and injury, "revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." 1 Tim. 2:2 the object of government is stated in these words: "That we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

II

It follows that all citizens are in duty bound to "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," i. e., honor, obedience, taxes. In particular, Christians are exhorted to intercede in behalf of the government. 1 Tim. 2.

That the duties outlined in Thesis II rest upon all citizens of a state follows from the fact that civil government is the representative of God according to the Fourth Commandment. Since all men, as creatures of God, are subject to His authority, so likewise they are subject to the authority which God has delegated to the higher powers. These obligations are (1) *honor*. We should respect the dignity of government officers because they are "gods" (Ps. 82), in God's place. When we honor the higher powers, we bestow such honor upon God. 1 Pet. 2:17: "Honor the king." Rom. 13:7: "Honor to whom honor is due." (2) *Obedience*. The government exercises its higher powers by passing and executing the laws of the land, and the subjects perform their duty by rendering obedience to them. Rom. 13:1: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers." V. 5: "Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath but also for conscience' sake." Not only for fear of the consequence of disobedience, which is punishment, but also as a matter of conscience. Peter says, 1 Pet. 2:13: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake," because of the Lord God, who stands behind the laws issued by the government. Titus 3:1: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." The only exception is: When the government commands to commit sin, then we must obey God rather than men, Acts 5:29. (3) *Taxes*. Rom. 13:7: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom." Tribute, *phoros*, land taxes; custom, *telos*, taxes on goods, or mercantile tax. When Jesus said to the Pharisees: "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's" (Matt.

22:21), He was answering their question "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar or not?" For tribute Matthew uses the word *kensos* (*census*), head tax, while Luke (20:22) says *phoros*. (4) *Intercession*. The highest and most vital service to the government can be rendered only by Christians, namely, intercession. 1 Tim. 2:1, 2: "I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings, and for all that are in authority." We say "the highest and most vital service" because by the prayers of His Christian people God is moved to preserve the government He has ordained, and to dispose the civil powers that they safeguard life and limb of the citizenship, and to use the strong arm of the government to serve the interests of the Christian Church. The best and most efficient citizens in the land should be and are the Christians. By their intercession the Christians constitute a mightier bulwark of support to the government than an army, a two-ocean navy, and a large air force. The Scriptures reveal that God blesses cities and nations because of the Christians in them.

III

In the exercise of its obligation to protect the land the government may find it necessary to wage war.

As civil government is instituted to protect life, limb, and property of its subjects and to maintain law and order, it is vested with power to enforce its duties. The power of government reaches its height in the sword, the *ius gladii*, the power over life and death of human beings. Rom. 13:4: "He beareth not the sword in vain." The sword in the hands of the government is not, as Luther says, a fox's tail. No; "he is a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." And the government is vested by God with the authority to draw the sword not only against evil-doers among its subjects, but also against foreign governments or nations who give the government cause to use the sword against them. It is arbitrary to limit the government's right of the sword to evil-doers at home, and to deny this right concerning evil-doers abroad. There is no such limitation in the text. The apostle simply says that the government bears the sword to punish evil-doers, no matter where they are. The government is at the head of a sovereign nation and must defend the rights of the people when these rights are infringed upon by other nations. When differences arise between nations, the governments should endeavor to adjust them by negotiation. However, if greed and lust for power gain the upper hand in the foreign rulers, if in spite of all efforts for a peaceful settlement they persist in violating the rights of a sovereign people, it becomes the duty of the higher

powers to call out the armed forces of the land and to wage war. Dr. A. L. Graebner, (Theol. Quart., Vol. 3): "In the performance of these duties, states and their governments must employ all lawful means necessary for the achievement of their purpose. The extreme measure to which they are bound to resort when other means have failed to secure the effective protection of the rights of subjects is war. Deut. 20:10-12; Num. 21:21 ff.; 1 Tim. 2:2; Rom. 13:3, 4. War is the state or relation of armed hostility which, interrupting or replacing a state or relation of peace, prevails when and while contending parties possessing or claiming political sovereignty are deciding or endeavoring to decide, securing or endeavoring to secure, by regulated violence what they could not or would not decide or secure by peaceable measures and means. Gen. 8:22; Num. 2:21-25; Deut. 20:5-8, 10 ff., 19; Rom. 13:4. . . . A sovereign political power has just cause of war when its rights or the rights of its members have been or are being violated by another power and that other power is unwilling or unable to abate or redress such injuries. Num. 10:19; John 18:36; Rom. 13:3, 4, 6; 1 Tim. 2:2; 1 Pet. 2:13. But as war itself entails loss and insecurity of life and limb to many members of the body politic, the restoration of peace must be one of the aims of war. Peace should be considered the normal state of the community (Gen. 8:22; 9:1 ff.), and the preservation of peace should be the honest endeavor of the government until its cardinal purpose, the protection of its subjects in their quiet enjoyment of their rights, makes the temporary interruption of the state of peace, war, a necessity."

When civil government, after exhausting all endeavors for a peaceable agreement takes the sword in defense of its rights against an enemy nation, it is waging a *defensive* war. On this Luther writes in his answer to Herr Assa: *Ob Kriegsleute auch in einem seligen Stand sein koennen* (Volks-Bibliothek, Vol. 5, p. 137): "We shall proceed to the second part, whether equal may fight and wage war with equal. Not that it is right to provoke war after any insane lord's head; for this I will have said first above all things: He who begins war is in the wrong, and it is fair that he suffer defeat and be punished in the end who first flashes the knife, as it also has generally come to pass in all histories that they lost who began war and rarely those were defeated who had to defend themselves. For secular government has not been instituted by God to break peace and provoke war, but to maintain peace and oppose war, as Paul says, Rom. 13, that the office of the sword is to protect and punish, to protect the pious in peace and to punish the evil with war. And God, who will not suffer wrong-doing, also disposes matters so that war is made on the

warriors, and as the saying there goes: Never was one so wicked, he found one still more wicked. Therefore God lets it be sung of Him (Ps. 68): '*Dissipa gentes, quae bella volunt*' (scatter Thou the people that delight in war). Beware of that, He does not lie; and let it be said to you that you separate far, far: to want and to must; desire and necessity. . . . Look at the right soldiers who have been in the fray; they do not draw quickly; they have no desire to strike. However, when you force them that they must, then beware; then they will not scold. Their knife sits tight; but must they draw it, it will not return to the sheath without blood. Again, the insane fools who first war with thoughts and begin masterfully to devour the world with words and are the first with flashing knives, they are also the first to flee and put back the knife. The Romans, that mighty empire, mostly won with this, that they had to wage war; that is, every one wanted to challenge them in some way and triumph at their expense, so that they had to defend themselves. Then they struck bravely about themselves. Hannibal, the prince from Africa, hurt them very much, so that he almost annihilated them. But what shall I say? He had begun; he also had to stop; for God is an enemy of those who provoke war and break peace."

When is a government justified in declaring war on another government or nation? The Lutheran dogmatician John Gerhard, called the archtheologian and "the oracle of his time," in his *Loci Theologici* summarizes the justifiable causes of war under three heads: 1. *Necessaria Defensio*; 2. *Iusta Vindicatio*; 3. *Legitima Ablatorum Recuperatio*.

We have just dealt with the defensive war. What is meant by *iusta vindicatio*? Rom. 13:4 Paul states that the government is "a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." Originally God is the only avenger. Rom. 12:19: "Vengeance is mine; I will repay saith the Lord." For the maintenance of justice in the world God has committed the punishment of evil-doers into the hands of the government. After the great flood the Lord laid down the decree: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," Gen. 9:6. The murderer's blood shall be shed by man, by the constituted authorities. That applies also to a government or nation of evil-doers that inflict wrong upon another nation; the government of the latter is then called upon to avenge wrong, to visit punishment upon the evil-doers. "What else is war than to punish wrong and evil?" asks Luther, and then goes on: "Why is war waged but to obtain peace and obedience? Although it does not seem that killing and robbing is a Christian work, yet it is in truth a work of love. When I look at warfare and see how it punishes the wicked, kills the evil-doers, and brings about such

misery, it seems to be an unchristian work and in every way contrary to Christian love. But when I see that it protects the pious, keeps and preserves wife and child, house and home, property, honor and peace, it becomes apparent how precious and divine the work is, and I note that it cuts off a leg and a hand in order that the whole body may not perish. For, if the sword would not oppose evil and preserve peace, then everything that is in the world must perish through 'Unfriede'. Therefore such a war is nothing less than a short 'Unfriede' which prevents an everlasting, immeasurable 'Unfriede,' a small calamity. What is written and said to show what a great calamity war is, is all true. But one should also look to this, how many times greater the calamity is which is prevented by war. Yes, if people were pious and loved peace, then waging war would be the greatest calamity on earth. But don't fail to consider that the world is wicked, people do not want to keep peace, but plunder, steal, kill, rape wife and child, take honor and goods. Such general 'Unfriede' over all the world in which no man could live, the little 'Unfriede' which is called war or sword must ward off. Therefore God honors the sword so highly that He calls it His own ordinance and does not want that one may say or imagine that man has invented or instituted it. For the hand that wields such sword and kills is no longer man's hand but God's hand, and not man but God hangs, quarters, decapitates, kills, and wages war. They are all God's works and His judgments." (Vol. 5, pp. 108, 109.)

On the third cause for a justifiable war, the recovery of stolen property or rights, Gerhard gives four instances, 1. *Legatorum Violatorum*. 2 Sam. 10:4; 1 Chron. 19:4. 2. *Pactorum Violatio*. 2 Kings 3:5. 3. *Cum Hostibus Conjunctio*. 2 Sam. 8:5. 4. *Publicorum Flagitiorum Neglecta Vindictio*. Judg. 20:13; Lev. 18:25.

IV

In such a crisis, all citizens must rally to the support of their government and bear arms when called upon.

This follows from the preceding. It is the obedience which Rom. 13 and the Fourth Commandment impose upon the subjects. When citizens are enrolled by the government as soldiers, then they directly share in the activities of the government. In time of war, especially when the life of the nation hangs in the balance, those who refuse military service are regarded as enemies. Dr. A. L. Graebner: "When in the exercise of police power the government calls upon the members of the body politic to render service, such service should be willingly rendered by those who are by such authoritative requisition constituted part and parcel of the government, organs of the municipality, or the state, and ministers of God." (Theol. Quart., Vol. 3.)

V

Christians also must for conscience' sake bear the sword when their government demands it. Quakers, Mennonites, and other pacifists who hold that all wars are mass murder violate plain statements of Scripture.

The statement in thesis V rests on theses III and IV. If military service in time of war is the duty of all subjects, then Christians may not be excused. Apology, Art. 16. Luther in his tract on civil government (*Ueber die weltliche Obrigkeit*) first establishes the *ius gladii*, the right of the sword and war, on the basis of Rom. 13. Then he takes up the objection, which has been raised again and again, that Christians should not avenge themselves, that they should suffer wrong rather than do wrong by killing their fellow-men, even fellow-Christians. He writes: "Against this there seems to be vigorously opposed what Christ says (Matt. 5:38, 39): 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if a man will sue thee at the law and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Again Paul (Rom. 12:19): 'Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.' Again (Matt. 5:44): 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you.' These and similar passages seem to say emphatically that the Christians in the New Testament shall not have a secular sword. Here we must divide all of Adam's children into two parts: first, those in the kingdom of God, whose king is Christ. Now behold, these people need no secular sword, no law. And if all the world were true believers, no prince, king, lord, sword, or law would be necessary or needful. Wherefore would these things serve? Because they have the Holy Spirit in their hearts, who teaches and makes them such people as injure no one, love every one, and gladly and joyously suffer wrong from everybody, even death, therefore it is out of the question that among Christians secular sword and law should find anything to do. As Paul says (1 Tim. 1:9): 'The law is not made for a righteous man.' Secondly, those in the kingdom of the world, to whom belong all those that are not Christians. For since few believe and follow the Christians' way of not resisting evil, God has aside of the Christian state and His kingdom instituted another state and cast them under the sword, that, even if they would, they cannot carry out their wickedness; just as a wild animal is enclosed with chains and bonds that it cannot bite and break, as it gladly would according to its nature. Therefore God has created the two states: the spiritual, which

makes Christians and pious people through the Holy Spirit under Christ, and the worldly state, which forces the unchristians and wicked that they must keep peace and be quiet without their thanks. Therefore Paul also says that rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil. Thus you see what Christ's word in Matt. 5, etc., aims at. Really He speaks these words only to His dear Christians. They alone accept them and do accordingly. If now the whole world were Christians, these words would apply to all of them. However, since they are unchristians, these words do not apply to them; but they belong into the other state in which unchristians are forced to peace and good behavior.

"Here you will say: Since the Christians do not require the secular sword and law, why does St. Paul say to all Christians: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers'? Answer: Because a real Christian on earth does not live for himself but for his neighbor, whom he serves. Therefore according to his spirit he does also that which he himself does not need, but which is useful to his neighbor. Now, however, since the sword is a great and necessary benefit in all the world that peace be maintained, sins be punished, and wickedness be restrained, therefore the Christian commits himself under the estate of the sword, gives tribute, honors the government, works, serves, helps, and does all he can to the advantage of the higher power, in order that it be maintained in honor and fear, although he does not need it for himself but looks to that which is needful and good for others. You do not need that your enemy be punished; however your sick neighbor does; him you should help that he may have peace and the enemy be resisted, which cannot be done unless power and government be maintained in honor and fear.

"So, then, you ask: May also a Christian wield the sword and punish the wicked, since Christ's words are so clear that you shall not resist evil? Answer: You have now heard two things: one, that the sword cannot be among Christians, for they do not need it. The other, that it is your duty to serve the sword and be in its service with everything possible, be it body, property, honor, and soul. For it is a work which is altogether needful and necessary for the whole world and your neighbor. In this manner the two go well side by side, that you at the same time render sufficiency to God's kingdom and the kingdom of the world outwardly and inwardly; at the same time you suffer evil and wrong and yet you punish evil and wrong; at the same time you do not resist evil and you resist evil. For with the one you look to yourself and yours, with the other to the neighbor and his. As far as you and yours are concerned, you hold to the Gospel and suffer

wrong as a true Christian. As far as the neighbor and his are concerned, you do according to love and suffer no wrong for your neighbor; which the Gospel does not forbid; yes, it commands it in other places." (Volks-Bibliothek, Vol. 27, pp. 91—102.)

The Bible also speaks of exemplary Christians who either approved of the profession of soldiers or were soldiers themselves. According to Luke 3:14 John the Baptist instructed the soldiers who came to him with the question, What shall we do? in this manner: "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages." Then there is Cornelius (Acts 10:31 ff.), the Centurion of Capernaum (Luke 7:2), and others. It may not be contended that these men were merely policemen, commissioned only to maintain order among the unruly Jews in Palestine. No; they were in the emperor's service. In the event of war they were the front-line troops, because they were trained in military science as professional soldiers. Let us again hear Luther (*Ueber die weltliche Obrigkeit*, p. 104): "And that we also prove it by the New Testament, there stands fast here John the Baptist, who without doubt had to witness, show, and teach Christ; that is, his doctrine must of necessity be of the New Testament and evangelical. He confirms the profession of soldiers, saying that they should be satisfied with their wages. If it had been unchristian to wield the sword, he should have rebuked and ordered them to forsake both wages and sword; otherwise he would not have taught them the true Christian life. Also St. Peter, preaching to Cornelius of Christ, does not order him to forsake his profession, which he should have done had it hindered his Christianity. In addition, before he was baptized, the Holy Spirit came upon him. St. Luke also commends him as a pious man before Peter's preaching; and yet he does not censure him for being a soldier and a captain of the heathen emperor. Now, that which the Holy Spirit permitted to remain on Cornelius and did not rebuke it is meet and right that we also do not rebuke and let remain. The same example is given by the Eunuch of Ethiopia (Acts 8:39), whom Philip the evangelist converted and baptized and let him remain in his profession and go home, who could not without the sword have been such a mighty official of the Queen of Ethiopia." Then Luther also cites the case of Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:7) and refers to the many martyrs who served and perished in the armies of heathen Roman emperors.

Pastors also must don the military uniform if their government requires it. Dr. C. F. W. Walther writes in a letter to Pastor J. C. W. Lindemann, dated April 27, 1861, shortly after the outbreak of the Civil War, as follows:

"MY DEAR BROTHER:

"In reply to your question I hasten to express the following. Since the apostle says *pasa psyche* must be subject to the government that has power over him, therefore the preacher must be subject to the government; and since the government has the sword and therefore the right to wage war 1. for defense, 2. for vengeance, 3. for the recovery of taken possessions and rights, therefore the preacher must be subject also then when he is ordered to join in the war. A Christian-minded government or one which is only sensible will not require this; but if it does, then obedience must be rendered also to the 'froward' (*tois skoliois*). . . . Though I have been unable to find a passage in the ancient teachers dealing with the obedience of preachers when they are called to arms, yet all agree in this, that the clergy both with their property and their persons are subject to the government. Yes, Gerhard writes: 'The servants of the Church are not to be forced to be active in battle (unless as chaplains), in order that they may have charge of the office of watchmen; however, some add the restriction that when the fatherland is in extreme danger of being overrun by the enemy, then persons of the Church, if they are available in larger numbers and have military training, have the duty to render help to the republic which is approaching destruction.'" (*Letters of Dr. C. F. W. Walther*. Vol. I, p. 162. Conc. Publ. House.)

In the second half of Thesis V we say that "Quakers, Mennonites, and other pacifists, who hold that all wars are mass murder, violate plain statements of Scripture." We have set forth that such an attitude does violence to Rom. 13, Titus 3, etc. The pacifist fails to recognize that government is divinely ordained for the purpose of protecting the lives and property of its subjects and that the citizen who is drafted for military service participates in the work of the government as it exercises its function to "visit wrath upon him that doeth evil." If all Americans were pacifists, we should be at the mercy of predatory nations, and it would not be long before rivers of blood would flow. However, we are concerned just now with a subtle pacifism which raises its head in church circles; a pacifism which would go half way, saying: Yes, war is justified in the case of actual invasion, when a nation must defend its life; but there we stop. We admit of no other just cause of war. Some of them make the claim that there are no just wars today.

Many people who generally speaking are pacifists are willing to admit that if there is ever any justification for resort to arms, it is an actual invasion of their own homeland.

That will never do. He who says A must say B. Essentially all just wars are wars of defense, also when no actual invasion is threatened. Just wars — and that includes wars to avenge wrong and to recover stolen possessions and rights — in the end are wars which a sovereign nation wages in defense of its rights, which the government is pledged by God to uphold. Not only pacifism flies in the face of Scripture, but also semipacifism. *Proceedings, Atlantic District*, 1940, p. 37: "There are times when the sword must decide an issue, just as it does in civil life. Within a country the citizens appeal to their government in matters of dispute with other citizens or ask for protection and justice. To that end the government has established courts, appoints judges and police magistrates, and arms them with power to enforce the law, even to the extent of confiscating property or the taking of human life. In the last analysis, therefore, it is the power that wields the sword which maintains peace and good government, even within the state.

In matters of dispute or the enforcement of justice between nations there is no superior power to decide, adjust, or enforce. When two sovereign powers collide, reason ought to prevail; but just as it fails within the state in civil and small matters, so it is bound to fail in a world of sinful, selfish, and imperfect human beings in the greater issues between nations, and because of that, war, or the power of the sword, remains as the only final arbiter."

VI

The "conscientious objector" should be reminded that conscience is enlightened and regulated by the Word of God. The question whether the government is waging a just or an unjust war is not for the Church to determine but must be referred to the conscience of the individual. Luke 12:14.

Conscience is a delicate faculty of the human soul. Conscience is the monitor implanted in our being by the Creator in order to keep us from wrong-doing. When conscience is violated repeatedly, then its sharp edge is dulled, its protests become fainter and fainter, and if the violation of conscience continues, the state will be reached which Paul terms "having their conscience seared with a hot iron," 1 Tim. 4:2. Therefore Luther said at Worms: "It is neither safe nor advisable to do anything against conscience." When a young man is drafted for military service, he is faced with a question of right or wrong, because in battle he may have to destroy human life. I am speaking of Lutheran young men whose consciences are somewhat enlightened and quickened by the Word of God. Some of the "conscientious objectors" today, I fear, are objectors without a conscience, not their conscience but other considerations motivating them in their attitude.

Now, we know what crooked things are being done to drag our nation into this war. There are sinister forces which work day and night to plunge America into this bloody struggle. Here are the "merchants of death," the munition-makers, who secretly intrigue with the mighty rulers of nations to keep the world-fire burning and to spread it. There are others who feverishly agitate war in order to protect their foreign investments and then speak of maintaining our way of life, of saving the last outpost of civilization, etc. When our Lutheran young men, seeing and knowing this, are subjected to the draft, some of them say: We would rather go behind the bars than have a hand in this bloody affair; our consciences protest against such a course. Now, has the church, has the pastor, anything to say to a youth in this distress of soul? We answer: Indeed! If there is no cause to doubt the sincerity of the objector, then the Church must say to him: "*You dare not under any circumstance violate your conscience.* If to your own satisfaction you can prove that the government is provoking, or is engaged in, an unjust war so that your conscience protests against having a part in it, being bound in God's word 'Thou shalt not kill,' then the Church says to you: It is your duty to resist, because you must obey God rather than men (Acts 5:29) and suffer the consequences of your refusal to serve."

In support of this let us again quote Luther. In *Ob Kriegsteute auch, etc.*, p. 154, he says: "Another question: *What if my lord is wrong in waging war?* Answer: If you know of a certainty that he is wrong, then you shall fear and obey God rather than men and shall not wage war nor serve, for then you can have no good conscience before God. Yes, you say, my lord forces me, takes my property, does not give me my money and wages; in addition, I would be despised and abused as a coward, yes, as faithless, before the world, who forsakes his master in distress, etc. Answer: That you must risk and for the sake of God let go what goes. He can restore it to you a hundredfold as He promises in the gospel: "Whosoever shall forsake house and home, wife, property, shall receive it a hundredfold, etc."

Gerhard (translated from the Latin): "It is asked whether the subjects are bound to obey the magistrate to whatever war he calls them. We answer: In order that the consciences of the subjects be advised, a distinction must be made between a war notoriously unjust and one whose cause is doubtful or hidden. If the magistrate moves towards a notoriously unjust war, the subjects are absolved from obedience according to the apostolic rule, Acts 5:29: '*Oportet Deo magis obedire quam hominibus.*' So the footmen that stood about Saul, commanded of the king to kill the priest Abimelech, did right in refusing to carry out the

order, 1 Sam. 22:17. The Egyptian midwives did right in refusing obedience to the royal mandate to throw the Israelite infants into the river, Ex. 1:17." (*Loci Theologici*, Vol. 6, p. 506.)

Man's conscience is not subject to any human might or authority. Freedom of conscience is the inalienable right of man. And the worst slavery is to lord it over the conscience of man. In matters of conscience, man deals directly with his God; and if he violates the dictates of his conscience, he commits a sin.

Erring Conscience. Quaker, Mennonites, and Pacifists in the Church who regard all war as mass murder have an erring conscience, as was set forth above. When we have to do with such people, we must endeavor to expose their error in the light of God's Word, thus enlightening, regulating, and correcting their conscience so that it may conform to the Word of God. However, if such efforts fail, they must be told under no circumstances to violate their conscience. They must also be reminded that by holding such an unbiblical view of war and refusing obedience to the powers that be, which are representatives of God, they are taking upon themselves an awful responsibility.

Dr. A. L. Graebner: "The false norm having once established itself in the place of the true norm and usurped its dignity, conscience will not only determine the ethical character of an act according to this norm, but also assert the stringency of the false norm, making its false dictates binding upon the soul, imposing upon the subject the duty of doing that which is wrong and abstaining from that which is right. And this is the fearful predicament of a man with an erring conscience, that under its influence he will sin whatever he may do or forbear, according to the false statements of his erring conscience or in spite of them. For by obeying his conscience when it makes sin a duty, the Roman Catholic worshiper of saints certainly sins; and, again, if contrary to the dictates of his conscience he neglects his prayers to Mary and Joseph, he also sins, *inasmuch as to act against the voice of his conscience is sin.*"

Doubting Conscience. If a man say: I see what is going on to drag our country into this bloody business, but there are many things also which I do not know. I do not have access to Government records and official documents; I do not know how much of this war propaganda is lying propaganda; I do not know what kind of secret commitments the Government may have made to foreign governments. Therefore I am disturbed and in doubt. I do not want to become guilty of staining my hands with innocent blood, but I hesitate to resist the lawful authority which God has placed over me. That is the case of many Lutheran young men at this time.

To such a one the Church, the pastor, must say: "You cannot act with a doubting conscience. Your conscience is to be your guide, directing you which way you should go. If it is not functioning as a guide, then you can not go either to the right or to the left. Rom. 14:23: 'He that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith, and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' To act against a doubting conscience is as much a sin as to act against an erring conscience. If further study does not dissolve such doubts, then the Church must give this positive advice: '*Tene certum, relinque incertum.*' If you cannot for yourself determine what is right or wrong, then relinquish the uncertain and set your feet upon something certain; your Government is instituted by God; therefore obey its mandate, and you can have a good conscience.

Luther, *Ueber die weltliche Obrigkeit*, p. 139: "How if the subjects should not know whether their prince is right or wrong? Answer: Because they can neither know nor find out by all possible diligence, they may follow [the government] without danger of the soul. For in such a case one must use the law of Moses, Ex. 21:13, where he writes how a murderer who ignorantly or unwillingly kills some one, shall through flight to a free city and by the court be absolved. So also God excused even Abimelech, the king (Gen. 20:6), when he took Abraham's wife; not that he did right therein, but because he had not known that she was Abraham's wife."

Gerhard, *Loci Theologici*, Vol. 6, p. 506 ff. (translated from the Latin): "If, however, the cause of war is doubtful or hidden, the subjects should observe the common rule '*Tene certum, relinque incertum.*' Now, it is certain that the subjects owe obedience to the government when it is not obviously and manifestly wicked and unjust. Therefore they should not in curiosity and improperly (*praepostere*) investigate the causes of war and the counsels of the government but render what is due to the office. When, now, the cause of war is not in the highest degree and in every way sufficient and legitimate, the subjects are yet absolved from sin when they take up arms in compliance with the government's demand. So the judge sins who condemns him to death whose case is not yet sufficiently known and examined, but the executioner that carries out the sentence does not sin, who kills him that is condemned to death because he obeys his superior, whose doubtful sentence he can not obstruct." St. Augustine: "Not even that war which is waged by human lust can do any harm either to the incorruptible God or to His saints, to whom it is found to be of advantage in the exercise of patience, the humiliation of the spirit, and the bearing of a paternal

discipline, since a just man, if he serves perhaps in the army of a king who is an ungodly man, can rightly fight at his command, serving the order of civic peace, as a man to whom it is either certain that what is commanded is not contrary to the command of God or to whom it is not certain whether it is [i. e., contrary to the command of God], so that the iniquity of the command accuses the king, but the nature of the service will show the innocence of the soldier." (Augustinus, lib. 22, *Contra Faustum*, c. 75.)

Dr. A. L. Graebner, *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 3: "And though, or because, war as such is an affair of the entire body politic (Ex. 17:8; Num. 21:23; 20:7), it is not the business of an individual member or a part in the state, but of the organs of the entire body, the supreme government, to determine when war has become a necessity, to decide upon and declare a state of war, and to determine, supervise, and control the measures of warfare. (1 Pet. 2:13 f.; Prov. 8:15; Rom. 13:3 f.)"

When Paul said before Festus (Acts 25:11): "I appeal unto Caesar," he did not speak as an apostle and as a churchman, but as a Roman citizen. Accordingly, conscientious objectors should first of all present their case not to the church but rather as citizens bring their scruples to the attention of the civil authorities. Observing this principle, Dr. C. F. W. Walther wrote to a conference which he could not attend because of the Civil War: "You will not pass so-called patriotic resolutions, which does not behoove you as theologians." (*Letters*, Vol. I, p. 170.)

We say in the second half of Thesis VI that it is not within the province of the Church to declare a particular war just or unjust. Luke 12:14. To the man who said to Jesus: "Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me," the Lord replied: "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you?" Here was a question of right or wrong, and the all-wise Son of God could have quickly settled the matter. But in emphatic language the Lord denied the petition, because He would not interfere with Moses, as Luther and the Weimar Bible say. That was a question for the civil authorities to adjust. Jesus' mission was to establish the kingdom of God. We hold that that applies here. "The Church is inspirational, not institutional," some one has well said. The Church, as a spiritual kingdom, should lay down principles, enlighten the conscience, and supply the motives by the Gospel, to serve God and the neighbor. As Melancthon says, *Apology*, Art. 16: "The kingdom of Christ is spiritual, to wit, beginning in the heart the knowledge of God, the fear of God and faith, eternal righteousness and eternal life." In a political controversy the Church is not instructed to invade the domain of the State and issue decrees and decisions on matters concerning which

there are widely contrasted differences of opinion. Dr. David Brown (Jamieson-Fausset-Brown) comments on Luke 12:14: "The influence of religious teachers in the external relations of life has ever been immense when it is only the indirect effect of their teaching; but whenever they interfere directly with secular and political matters, the spell of that influence is broken." Coming from a Calvinist, this is all the more significant; because it is just the Calvinistic churches with their pastors who want to regulate the state with church laws.

Moreover, in most cases the Church is not in a position to declare a war just or unjust because of the deceptive propaganda with which the issue is beclouded, because the public is inflamed, and war hysteria is aroused. The Church does not have access to the archives of the government, which might reveal the underlying causes of a certain war.

It might be more convenient for some if the Church gave a clear-cut pronouncement: This war is just or unjust. *Roma locuta est*. However, let us leave that to Rome. Rome has always taken charge of the conscience of the individual. Rome has as far as is possible destroyed that in man which separates him from the beast: the conscience. That is slavery, tyranny of the basest sort. The right of private judgment is the heritage of the Reformation restored by Luther.

There is another item to be considered here. If the Church at large, a synod, or conference, or a pastor in his congregation declared a certain war unjustified, would that convince every one? At such a time when passions are aroused and nerves are on edge, would he not be throwing a spark into the powder-keg? All kinds of consequences could easily follow such mistaken zeal. On April 3, 1861, Dr. C. F. W. Walther wrote to Pastor J. C. W. Lindemann: "The nearest surroundings of our college threaten to become the scene of conflict between the might of the administration and the government of our State; we were therefore forced to close the institution. To this chasm the Republican-Abolition Party has now happily brought us. And what is most terrible to me is that some of our Lutherans, yes, even pastors, have contributed to this. That is taking its terrible revenge now, and may lead to the destruction of our whole Church." (*Letters*, Vol. I, p. 163. On Dr. Walther's attitude concerning the Civil War, read pp. 226, 162, 169, 201, 231, 235.)

One more consideration. If the Church takes this stand, advising and directing the individual, when in doubt, to obey the order of the government—does that not mean that the government, which, of course, desires all possible support and cooperation, might use the Church for sinister ends; that the Church is being

used as an agency to support greedy war-mongers to wax fat on blood money? Yes; that is so. But what of it? The attitude and action of the Church is constantly being misconstrued by the ungodly world. The Church testifies against the false principles underlying the prohibition laws, and promptly she is slandered as favoring drunkenness and debauchery. "For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners," Matt. 11:18, 19. During the World War, twenty-five years ago, the Church made the same experience and willingly suffered the consequences of her stand. Does not the present Advent season remind us of the answer Jesus gave to the delegation from John the Baptist: "Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me," Matt. 11:6. Our duty is to make sure that we are in the right, then let the consequences be what they may. Let us not take offense at the Cross of Christ. "By honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report, as deceivers and yet true," 2 Cor. 6:8.

This is the position and attitude of the historic Lutheran Church from Luther down to the present day. It is the teaching of the Confessions of our Church, of her greatest dogmatician since Luther, John Gerhard, and of others.

VII

A Christian pastor should therefore counsel and exhort his parishioners to pray for their government and be alert citizens; through the orderly processes of democratic government to make their voices heard in opposition to all measures they consider as militating against security, order, and righteousness; in time of national stress to uphold the government loyally and to resist only when commanded to sin. Acts 4:19-20; 5:29.

The Christian pastor is the incumbent of an exalted office, a curate of souls. His field of activity is the spiritual. He is divinely charged to instruct, guide, counsel, and direct his hearers so that they become Christians, remain Christians unto the end, and order their lives according to the commandments of God. He is to preach and teach the whole counsel of God for man's salvation. He will, first of all, by the proclamation of the sinner's justification before God by grace through faith lead men into the kingdom of God. But he will also urge sanctification of life and instruct his parishioners in the right conduct in all relations of life, including the divinely commanded attitude towards civil government. It is an office of trust. The Christian pastor wields a deep influence upon the lives of his members. To repeat: "The influence of religious teachers in the external relations of life has ever been

immense when it is only the indirect effort of their teaching; but whenever they intermeddle directly with secular and political matters, the spell of that influence is broken."

Titus was a young pastor in Asia Minor. To him Paul wrote (Titus 3): "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." Another young pastor was Timothy, to whom Paul wrote (1 Tim. 2): "I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men, for kings and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." In a situation such as the present one in our land the Christian pastor should preach patriotic sermons, not only on the Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity but otherwise also, exhorting the people to perform their civic duties: to make use of the ballot; to write to Congressmen against measures they consider harmful, advancing their suggestions; to inculcate that young men be trained for offices of public trust, as lawyers, judges, and Congressmen; in the general church prayer on Sundays and in private to intercede in behalf of the higher powers; and, finally, to resist only when it is plain that the government is commanding to do wrong, as Peter and John did according to Acts 4 and 5.

In conclusion, I would quote a brother who has written me. "In our preaching, teaching, guiding, and molding the consciences of men we must emphasize the rule of obedience to the government. One cannot make the exception to the rule his specialty for preaching, teaching, guiding, and molding the consciences of men, especially not if one must be 100 per cent. sure of his ground when objecting to measures the government inaugurates. Luther gives the exception little space and place and is constantly hammering away at the rule of obedience. Even while he admits the corruption of government and decries everything in connection with it, he insists on obedience practically at all times. And the objector must be content with whatever treatment he will receive from the government. The laws of a state and commonwealth are framed not to favor the objector, but the supporter of the government."

Hudson, N. Y.

LOUIS J. ROEHM



Verbal Inspiration — a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks

(Continued)

We are asked to give up the doctrine of verbal inspiration because of the alleged erroneousness of the Bible. The moderns are asking us to do that. And our own flesh is suggesting it.¹⁴⁾ We find it impossible to do so. One reason for that is that the arguments advanced by the rationalists against the infallibility of Scripture are in conflict with sound reason. We shall demonstrate this in a later article, and that demonstration will serve a good purpose. But that is a matter of minor importance. The chief reason, the real reason, why we cannot give up Verbal Inspiration is that our Christian conscience, formed and guided by God's Word, forbids it. By doing it we should be violating the Christian faith and putting the Church and the individual believer in grave danger. To those who would entice us away from an inerrant Bible we give this answer: No Christian can declare, in his sober mind, that God's Word contains errors. And when the Christian realizes that Scripture is God's Word, he cannot, absolutely he cannot, declare that the Holy Scriptures contain errors. Nor will he ever be ready to place the Bible in the hands of his fellow-men with the warning that it is not reliable in all its statements.

No Christian will, in his sober mind, say that Scripture, the Word of God, contains a single error. Dr. Pieper says: "All objections to the divine inspiration and the inerrancy of the Bible are unworthy of a Christian." (*What Is Christianity?* p. 257.) Having quoted Luther: "When you hear people who are so blinded and hardened that they deny that what Christ and the apostles spoke and wrote is the Word of God, . . . just keep silence, do not say one word to them; say only this: I shall give you sufficient ground from Scripture; if you believe, well; if not, just go your way" (IX:1238), Dr. Pieper comments: "It is, according to Luther,

14) Dr. G. Stoeckhardt: "It is true that, through the grace of God, no tendency to sympathize with the wisdom of modern theology has as yet manifested itself in our church-body. However, we should never forget that the seed of doubt, of unbelief, is implanted in all of us by nature. And this doubting, continually arising in the natural heart, has in all ages questioned particularly the truth of Scripture, the fountain of all divine truth." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 32, p. 164. On p. 313 ff. Dr. Stoeckhardt deals with the "errors" and "contradictions" in the Bible on which our doubt feeds. See also *Proceedings of Ev. Luth. Synodical Conference*, 1902, p. 21, on the doubts aroused in the hearts of the Christians by these "contradictions.") The following lines are not addressed to the moderns, who will cast them aside as representing the outmoded theology of obscurantism. They are addressed to the disturbed Christian who needs to be shown the wickedness of his doubtings.

utterly unworthy of a Christian to refuse to accept that which Christ and the apostles spoke and wrote as God's Word and inerrant." (*Christliche Dogmatik*, I, p. 293.) The thought that the Bible is a mixture of truth and error cannot find permanent lodgment in the Christian heart.

The Christian thinks too much of his Bible for that. We look upon the Bible, and God wants us to look upon the Bible, as a most holy thing. "Halte von dieser Schrift als von dem allerhoechsten, edelsten Heiligtum." (Luther, XIV:4.) It is clothed with divine majesty. It is the *Word of God*. What is written in the Scriptures was spoken of the Lord by the prophets and apostles (Matt. 1:22). What Moses wrote is "the Word of God" (Mark 7:10, 13), and what Paul wrote "are the commandments of the Lord," 1 Cor. 14:37. The Scriptures are "the oracles of God," Rom. 3:2. And we stand in holy awe of these words, the very words of our God and Lord. Every single word and letter of Scripture is to us sacred and inviolable. "The Holy Scriptures," 2 Tim. 3:15. (See *Proceedings, Iowa Dist.*, 1897, p. 28.)

Holy Scripture is to us the most holy thing in the world. That is the attitude which God requires of the Christian. "To this man will I look that trembleth at My Word," Is. 66:2. We cannot treat it as a human book, subject to criticism and censorship. What we read in this Book we receive not as the word of men but, as it is in truth, the Word of God. 1 Thess. 2:13. When the Christian preacher proclaims the contents of this Book, he knows that he is speaking the oracles of God, 1 Pet. 4:11. With awe and reverence St. Peter read his Bible, for here "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," 2 Pet. 1:21. So Luther looked upon the Bible. "To me God's Word is above all, and the majesty of God is on my side." (XIX:337.) "You must follow straight after Scripture and receive it and utter not one syllable against it, for it is God's mouth." Even when this Book speaks of mere temporal matters, "you are so to deal with it that you think that God Himself is saying this" (III:21). Every single passage of Scripture is clothed with the majesty of God. "As for me, every single Bible-text makes the world too narrow for me." (XX:788.) John Wesley, too, "saw God at the beginning of every section of Holy Scripture. . . . To Wesley, there were two great realities — the visible Book and its invisible but ever-present Author." (See J. A. Cottam, *Know the Truth*, p. 28.) The holy awe that dominates the Christian's study of the Bible makes it utterly impossible for him to utter such a prayer as this: Dear Lord, enlighten my mind that I may separate the errors in Thy Word from the truth it contains. Whatever evil thoughts arise in the Christian's head, his heart will not permit him thus to dishonor God's Word.

Again, the Christian loves the Bible. He loves it because he owes to it everything he prizes. Searching the Scripture, he has found therein eternal life (John 5:39), certainty in doubt, comfort in affliction, strength in weakness, and all spiritual blessings. And loving this Book above all things, he will not permit any man to cast aspersions upon it and dishonor it. Do the moderns really believe that, when they besmire and befoul the Bible, they have the approbation of the Christian?

The Christian's attitude is this: "I have rejoiced in the ways of Thy testimonies as much as in all riches. I will delight myself in Thy statutes. Open Thou mine eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of Thy Law," Ps. 119:14 ff. Stop the mouth of those who are disfiguring its lovely beauty! — "O precious Book, a book above all books! Thou art a peaceful pool here on earth, which reflects the light of all the stars of the invisible heaven; thou art the letter sent from our eternal home to comfort us in the strange land; thou art the key of heaven for the faint-hearted pilgrim, wandering through this world filled with error, doubt, fear, and trouble; thou art the Word of our God, of our heavenly Father." (Walther, *Kasualpredigten*, p. 297.)

Moreover, this Book which all Christians love and revere, solemnly warns us against ascribing errors to it and demands instant acceptance by us of all of its statements. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," 2 Tim. 3:16. This little Bible-text makes the world too narrow for us. If we should deny that every word of Scripture is true, we could nowhere in the wide world find escape from the judgment this text would pronounce against us. "The Scripture cannot be broken," John 10:35. Nowhere does Scripture make a misstatement. If any man dares to eliminate the least statement of Scripture as untrustworthy, he is condemned by this Scripture, and the world has become too narrow for him. It is unworthy of a Christian to refuse to accept any portion of Scripture as the inerrant Word of God. Again: "Thy Word is truth," John 17:17. And: "These sayings," the sayings of Revelation and of the entire Bible, "are faithful and true," Rev. 22:6. Will men still speak of mistakes, discrepancies, contradictions, found in certain sayings of the Bible and demand that these sayings be eliminated from the "Word of God"? If they will do so, let them ponder the awful saying of Rev. 22:19: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life," etc. No; one who takes the Bible for his guide will not sit down with those who occupy themselves with making lists of "errors in the Bible."

St. Augustine would not do so. He wrote to Jerome: "This I have learned to do: to hold only those books which are called

the Holy Scriptures in such honor that I finally believe that not one of the holy writers ever erred." Quoting this statement, Luther endorses it and declares: "The Scriptures have never erred." (XV:1481.) Yes, and "the Scriptures *cannot* err" (XIX:1073). "It is certain that Scripture cannot disagree with itself." (XX:798.) "It is impossible that Scripture should contradict itself, only that it so appears to the senseless and obstinate hypocrites." (IX:356.) Luther was so filled with awe of the sacredness of Scripture that he would not and could not admit the possibility of errors and contradictions in Scripture, could not permit any portion of it to be violated and broken. "One little point of doctrine means more than heaven and earth, and therefore we cannot suffer to have the least jot thereof violated." (IX:650.)¹⁵⁾

Listen to the host of Christian theologians who up to the present time bear witness to the inviolability of Scripture, of all of Scripture. D. J. Burrell speaks thus: "The Book claims to be inspired, 'breathed of God.' . . . Wherefore it must have been inerrant truth; since it is unthinkable that God should breathe a lie." (*Why I Believe the Bible*, p. 18.) L. Boettner: "We believe that the Bible is without an error from Genesis to Revelation. . . . This has been the historic Protestant position concerning the authority of Scripture. It was held by Luther and Calvin. In more recent times it has been reasserted by Hodge, Warfield, and Kuyper. . . . They have held that the Bible does not merely *contain* the Word of God, as a pile of chaff contains some wheat, but that the Bible in all its parts *is* the Word of God." (*The Inspiration of the Scriptures*, p. 17.) Without an error from Genesis to Revelation — let Quenstedt enlarge on that. He wrote — and the moderns quote his words again and again as a *dictum horrible*, while we find our heartfelt conviction expressed in them —: "In the canonical Scriptures there is found no falsehood, no misstatement, no error, not even the least, neither in the subject-matter nor in the words, but whatever they present, the whole of it and every part of it, is completely true, whether this pertain to the doctrines of faith or of morals, history or chronology, geography or nomenclature; no want of information, no thoughtlessness or forgetfulness, no lapse of memory, can or dare be ascribed to the penmen of the Holy Ghost as they wrote the sacred writings." (*Systema*, I, p. 112.)

And let Dr. Walther tell us who it is that wants us to find errors in the Bible. "The moderns charge this up against us as an error that we refuse to find errors in the Bible. . . . They ask us to deny with them the divine origin of the divine Word and to say,

15) "The context shows that Luther here has in mind every tittle of doctrine as expressed in the definite inviolable words of Scripture." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, I, p. 268. Look up this passage in Pieper.)

when we read any passage of the Bible: Yea, hath God really said this? But we refuse to make these words of *the fallen angel* our own. Nay; as often as we open our Bible, and wherever we open it, there comes to us a voice charging us: 'Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken,' Is. 7:2." (*Lutherstunde*. See *Proceedings, Iowa Dist.*, 9, p. 53.) Many today refuse to see God at the beginning of every section of the Bible. The more reason that we should say with Walther: "As Peter at the time when many fell away was the more ready to confess Christ: 'We believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God' (John 6:69), so we should, now that so many are becoming ashamed of the holy Book, proclaim the louder to the world: We believe and are sure that this despised Book is the truth, the Word of the living God." (*Kasualpredigten*, p. 304.)

And what Walther and Luther and Augustine said St. Paul said before them: "I worship the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and in the Prophets," Acts 24:14. Can you conceive of Paul saying that it is not incumbent on him or any other Christian to receive as true all that is written in the Old Testament and in the New Testament? Can you conceive of such a situation that the Holy Spirit, who spoke 2 Tim. 3:16, would at the same time permit His Christians to reject portions of Scripture as not inspired, as erroneous? Can you understand the psychology of a Christian who honestly believes in the Bible and yet feels at liberty to break Scripture here and there? It is utterly unworthy of the Christian to speak of mistakes in the Bible. Hugh M'Intosh takes the same position as Dr. Pieper. "In regard to the greater and supreme question as to the infallibility and divine authority of the teaching of the Lord on everything on which He clearly uttered His mind, and especially on the prime root question of the truthfulness, trustworthiness, divine origin, authority and inviolability of all Scripture, I hold firmly that my great teacher" (Prof. W. Robertson Smith) "took up *the only true, safe, and tenable position on which a Christian can take his stand*. This position . . . steadfastly rejects and precludes every theory of inspiration that questions or impugns, far more that disowns or denies, the infallibility and divine authority of the teaching of the Lord on anything He ever taught, on any statement He ever made, or any word He ever uttered. . . . Book I shows especially the decisiveness and absoluteness of His teaching on the *inviolable truth, thorough trustworthiness, and divine authority of all Scripture*." (*Is Christ Infallible and the Bible True?* p. 5 f.)¹⁶⁾ "Es ist

16) M'Intosh is taking issue with those who "declare the indefinite erroneousness and illimitable untrustworthiness of Scripture" (p. 2). Let us have one more quotation on the question whether a Christian can honestly believe and with a clear conscience maintain the erroneous-

einem Christen *unmoeglich*, zu glauben, dass die Heilige Schrift sich selbst widersprechen koenne." (*Proceedings Syn. Conf.*, 1902, p. 19.)¹⁷⁾

Should, then, the Christian judge from the outset, prior to, and independently of, any scientific and critical investigation, that any given statement of Scripture is absolutely true, on the sole basis of Scripture's claim of absolute infallibility? The moderns condemn such a position as due to inadmissible *a-priori* reasoning. The writer of the preface to J. M. Gibson's book *The Inspiration and Authority of Holy Scripture* says: "Dr. Gibson began in the old theory of inspiration, in which he would have remained had his been a metallic, inert, or mechanical mind. . . . He makes a valuable protest against the *vice of apriorism*, which comes down on the Bible with a theory of inspiration really drawn from rationalistic expectations, instead of rising out of the Bible from its inductive treatment as faith and science alike must do." (P. XV.)¹⁸⁾ J. De Witt too, has no use for the *a-priori* argument.

ness of Scripture. "If the Bible claims to be true, trustworthy, of divine origin and authority, — the Word of God, — it necessarily follows either that the Scriptures, as originally written, were so and cannot be indefinitely erroneous and untrustworthy, or that the Bible is untrue in its root doctrine and that its fundamental claim is false. It cannot be the Word of God, but must be merely the word of not only fallible, but untruthful or incredible men. . . . If the Bible claims in the name of God to speak the truth, and if it, as alleged, is erroneous or unreliable, then manifestly its root claim is false. . . . It cannot be the product of divine inspiration; for every idea of inspiration would be violated by the supposition that men writing under the power of the Holy Ghost should make a false claim." (Pp. 361, 363.)

17) "Holy Scripture cannot contradict itself. The Christian is sure of that, sure in advance, even before investigating the 'contradictions.' For (1) Scripture, being the Word of God, is true. . . . (2) Holy Scripture is inspired. . . . (3) Otherwise Scripture could no longer be the norm and rule of the Christian faith and life. . . . These considerations leave no room for argument; it is impossible for the Christian to think that Scripture could contradict itself." (Pp. 14—19. Get these *Proceedings* and study the full argument.)

18) Dr. Gibson writes: "I was brought up to believe that the whole fabric of our faith rested ultimately on the foundation of a book which, though written by many different authors, was yet from beginning to end not their work at all but that of God. They were simply God's penmen, and what they wrote was at His dictation." "This is the method which has till quite recently been most popular with the defenders of the authoritative inspiration of the Scriptures: they have postulated as a necessity of the case the emancipation of all the writers of Scripture from the effects of human weakness and limitation." The proper method is to "form a theory of inspiration not at the beginning but at the end of the inquiry." "According to that preconceived theory of inspiration it was supposed that men inspired of God . . . could speak with absolute scientific precision on every subject they touched." "Those who find rest in the conviction that they have in their possession a book every line and word of which is beyond the reach of error, have an ultimate authority not a whit better than that of the Romanist." (Pp. 4, 32, 36, 90, 115.)

He understands our position quite well: "The *a-priori* argument is very simple and intelligible. No evidence to the contrary is entitled to the slightest consideration. . . . If the *a-priori* argument be valid, all personal deficiency must have been miraculously supplied. There can be no failure of memory or lack of information . . . , no inapt quotation, no dialectic flaw." But he will have none of it. "This beautiful conception must be abandoned." "It must be confirmed by other than *a-priori* reasoning." This is the only proper method: "We shall then be prepared to produce a definition *a posteriori*, reasoning from the effect to its cause, from the consequent to the antecedent, from the revelation that lies before us in the Bible to the principle and method of the originating divine activity" (*What Is Inspiration?* pp. 9, 12, 42.)

Is any particular passage true? The obscurantists say: Since it is inspired, it is true. But "there are not a few passages in the Bible which cannot be regarded by Protestants as in any true sense inspired," declares Hastings, *Encyclopedia*, VII, p. 346. "After a free and fair investigation," applying the *a-posteriori* method, these many passages have been found to be mere human, false statements. "Protestant scholars of the present day, imbued with the scientific spirit, have no *a-priori* theory of the inspiration of the Bible. They do not open any book of the Old and the New Testament with the feeling that they are bound to regard its teaching as sacred and authoritative." And Prof. T. V. Kantonen tells us that, because we fail to apply the *a-posteriori* method, great portions of Holy Scripture become useless to us; we fail to find the truth that shall be revealed to those who reject the story as it is told in Scripture as true. "Relying upon the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Bible, rejecting *a priori* the results of constructive historical criticism, the adherents of this approach have regarded the stories of the Temptation and the Fall as mere historical narratives rather than profound prophetic philosophy of history." (*Luth. Church Quart.*, July, 1935, p. 211.)

Now, do we plead guilty to the charge of apriorism? We certainly do; only we have no sense of guilt about the matter. We are apriorists all along the line. On the general question: Does the Christian accept the Bible as the inspired Word of God because the Bible teaches us that it is inspired or does he accept it as such only after a thorough scientific investigation and demonstration? Theo. Kaftan, speaking for himself and the men just quoted, says: "We do not regard as authoritative what Scripture teaches concerning itself, but our judgment of what is the divine truth is based on the impression which Scripture makes upon us (insofern die Schrift sich bei uns 'durchsetzt')." (See Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 362.) Dr. Stoeckhardt makes this answer: "What Scripture says con-

cerning itself, its nature and origin, settles the matter for us." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 32, p. 280.) Dr. Stoeckhardt is an apriorist, and so are we. And we are thoroughgoing apriorists. The special question: Is a given statement in Scripture true? finds, for us, its answer in the general statement of Scripture: All Scripture is true. In approaching any Bible difficulty our mind is made up from the start: this passage is absolutely true. There may be difficulties about it, but the question: Is it true? does not present any difficulties to us. Dr. De Witt represents us as saying in this case: "No evidence to the contrary is entitled to the slightest consideration." Yes, we do say that, only that we say in addition: There can be no evidence to the contrary. We know *a priori* that any "evidence" to the contrary that may be adduced is false. And when Dr. Kantonen charges us with "rejecting *a priori* the results of constructive historical criticism," we only ask to amend it by substituting "destructive" for "constructive."

Dr. J. W. Horine is dumbfounded when he hears us say such things. Reviewing Dr. W. Arndt's book *Bible Difficulties*; "an Examination of the Passages of the Bible Alleged to Be Irreconcilable with Its Inspiration," he says: "Naturally, the author is a Fundamentalist, his viewpoint being that of the absolute inspiration and verbal inerrancy of the Bible in all its parts, which is the position of the Evangelical Lutheran Missouri Synod. The examination proceeds, and the conclusion is drawn, from the two premises: Every single statement of Scripture is literally true; the reader of Scripture must have faith enough to believe it to be true." (*The Lutheran*, July 28, 1932.) Yes, we take that position.

And we cannot take any other position. It is the only position befitting the Christian theologian. Let the Unitarians say: "No statement can be accepted as true because it is in the Bible" (see *Popular Symbolics*, p. 402), the Christian theologian cannot say it. He cannot thus dishonor his Bible. He holds Holy Scripture in such honor that he firmly believes that not one of the holy writers ever erred (Augustine), and he holds Holy Scripture in such honor that he accepts all and any of its statements without demanding further proof. What, tell Scripture to step aside for a while and call in some puny historian or scientist and, after hearing his verdict, tell Scripture: "Now I can accept your statement"? No, no; with the Christian it is axiomatic: "The Scriptures cannot err. . . . It is certain that Scripture cannot disagree with itself." "For it is established by God's Word that God does not lie, nor does His Word lie." (Luther, XX:798.) But that is apriorism — God's Word cannot lie because God's Word says it cannot lie! Of course it is, and the Christian cannot be anything but an apriorist in this matter. A Christian is one who believes God's Word; how, then,

can he demand that before he gives credence to any statement of God's Word, its truth must first be established by some other authority? The *ipse dixit* of Scripture suffices for the Christian.

"Philippi had not yet attained the Christian attitude towards Scripture when he wrote the words 'One dare not from the outset refuse to grant the possibility of the occurrence of minor discrepancies. . . . We therefore would not like to declare with Calov, at least not *a priori*: "No error, even in unimportant matters, no lapse of memory, . . . can anywhere occur in Scripture."' But he took the right position, the only one befitting a Christian, when he retracted this statement in the third edition of his *Glaubenslehre* and declared Calov's *a-priori* position to be the correct one." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 339.) — In the preface to his book *The Modern Use of the Bible*, a book dealing with the many "mistakes" of the Bible, H. E. Fosdick says: "The position represented in this book will of course be distasteful to those bound by a theory of literal inerrancy in their approach to the Bible." Fosdick is right. But he might have used a stronger word than "distasteful." We abominate and hate that approach to the Bible which operates with the possibility of errors in the Bible. And he is right again when he speaks of us as being "bound." We no longer approach Scripture with the "open mind" of the Unitarian, who claim the liberty to accept or reject so much of Scripture as his critical investigation permits or compels him to do. We are "bound," bound by the *a-priori* attitude that "Scripture cannot be broken."

It is a holy bondage. We are bondsmen of Scripture. That is to say that God has bound us. He requires us to accept His Word without questioning. And it is a willing bondage. It is nothing to be ashamed of. Man does not degrade himself by submitting his judgment to the judgment of the Lord God Almighty. And we would not want it otherwise. It is the only safe position to take. We close our eyes and blindly follow the lead of Scripture. Scripture will never deceive us. Following the lead of your critical investigations, you will go astray. We want to remain bondsmen of Holy Scripture.

This attitude is distasteful to Fosdick and the Unitarians and the moderns. They say it is based on prejudice, which does not permit a fair impartial judgment. They speak of our judgments as being biased and warped, they speak of assumptions and prepossessions and partisanship. Well, we are partisans of Scripture, uncompromising partisans. It is impossible for us to be unbiased in this matter. We should consider it sinful not to take the side of Scripture at once. Open mind? Our mind is made up, before the discussion on any passage opens, that Scripture is right and the critics are wrong. In fact, we do not allow any discussion. This

is a matter which is not debatable. The apriorists, thank God, are not open to argument. They are a stubborn lot.¹⁹⁾

In secular affairs, where men deal with men, we are not so stubborn. There we have an open mind. The juryman dare not make up his mind beforehand. He must first examine the evidence produced. It would be dishonest, immoral in the highest degree, if the judge permitted his preconceived opinion to affect his conduct of the trial. We have no use for prejudiced judges. Moreover, we do not open any book written by man with the idea that we are going to subscribe to all of its statements. We do not accept the pronouncement of the philosopher and the finding of the scientist and the judgment of the historian on their mere say-so. They must substantiate their *dicta* by irrefutable proof. But we dare not ask God and God's Book to submit to the same treatment. It is a wicked thing when the Unitarians and the other liberals place God's Book on a level with men's books — both subject to man's criticism. That was a horrible statement we quoted above: "As faith and science *alike* must do." Science is based on induction; faith accepts the *dictum* of God. N. R. Best says: "Predetermination of the outcome takes the honesty out of any inquiry." (*Op. cit.*, p. 131.) That applies where men deal with men, but it does not apply where God's Book is concerned, and just there Best applies it. On the preceding page (130) he declared that those who accept the miracle stories of the Bible as true take a wrong position when they say: "Whatever is told in this book you must believe just because it is found there." He has forgotten the fine statement

19) This apriorism is nothing strange in Christianity. It is ingrained in the very faith of the Christian. On no point of the Christian faith are we open to argument. We do not argue the articles of the Christian faith but we assert them. We would lose them if we awaited the assent of reason, logic, science. The right attitude, safe for us and profitable for the unbeliever, is expressed in "the admirable axiom of Dr. C. F. Deems: 'Believe your beliefs and doubt your doubts. Do not make the common mistake of the skeptics, doubting your beliefs and believing your doubts.'" (Quoted in *Many Infallible Proofs*, by A. T. Pierson, p. 26.) Pierson continues: "Or as Goethe says again: 'Give us your convictions; as for doubts, we have enough of them already.'" You do not serve the unbeliever by taking a wobbling position on any question concerning the Christian faith. — It is a pity that men know this principle but refuse to apply it in the matter of Inspiration. N. R. Best cannot believe in Verbal Inspiration and the inerrancy of Scripture because he insists on applying the *a-posteriori* method, and this same writer states that, in appraising the qualities of Scripture, he proceeds "on the *frank assumption* that a revelation of God has become an actuality in the volume of the Bible" and that this "assumption is of course a *premise of faith*, rather than a conclusion of logic. Even if occasion permitted the matter to be argued, argument would never demonstrate it. The ways of God, like the being of God, transcend syllogisms" (*Inspiration*, p. 12). And this assumption is created in us by God. Through Scripture He has established in us this premise of faith. The *a-priori* certainty is God's work and gift.

he made on page 12, concerning the "premise of faith." He has so completely forgotten the truth that faith is above reason that he can write on page 130: "If we have been at all right in arguing that the Bible is not only lawfully open to the investigations of human reason but is divinely calculated to invoke (even provoke) such investigation. . . ." Predetermination of the outcome takes the honesty out of any inquiry as between man and man, but the refusal to take the bare word of Scripture for establishing the truth of its statements dishonors God and disgraces the Christian.

Just by the way, why should the moderns indulge in such violent harangues against the wrong of *a-priori* reasoning, denouncing our attitude as due to prejudice and bias, when they are indeed guilty of this very thing? The liberals are unable to approach the Bible with an open mind. They approach it *with the preconceived opinion* that it is a human book, subject to errors. They meet its claim that it is God's Book *with suspicion*. They set up the *premise* that they know as much about these things as Scripture. They oppose to the premise of faith the premise of unbelief. They oppose the *ipse dixit* of Scripture with the *ipse dixit* of their own reason. H. M'Intosh hits it off pretty well when he writes: "If it should seem that I have severely handled any writers, it is only those who have roughly handled the Word of God and wrongly condemned the inspired writers, . . . who denounce every independent man that, after the example and on the authority of Christ and of His inspired apostles, would dare to uphold the Bible claim or to differ from the false but *oracular assertions* or to refuse to accept the *infallible ipse dixit* of those presumptuous speculators who are vain enough to *claim for their own crude, ephemeral productions what they deny to the oracles of God* and to the very words of even the Son of God." (*Op. cit.*, p. IX. — *Italics ours.*) Read the article by Prof. J. J. Reeve on "The Presuppositions of the Higher Criticism" in *Fundamentals*, III, p. 98 ff. "These presuppositions and assumptions are the determining elements in the entire movement. . . . It is their philosophy or world-view that is responsible for all their speculation and theories. . . . These presuppositions appealed to me very strongly. . . . But upon closer thinking I saw that the whole movement with its conclusions was the result of the *adoption of the hypothesis of evolution*. . . . The use of the Redactor is a case in point. This purely imaginary being, unhistorical and unscientific, is brought into requisition at almost every difficulty. . . . Their minds seem to be in abject slavery to their theory. Their mental attitude being biased and partial, their methods are partial and the results very one-sided and untrustworthy. . . . *They feel instinctively* that to accept the Bible statements would be the ruin of their hypothesis." That certainly is apriorism of the deepest dye!

It was in connection with the question of the reality of the miracles recounted in the Bible that Best charged us with "pre-determining the result of the inquiry." Well, Ph. Schaff tells these people: "The reality of the miracles cannot be disposed of by a simple denial from *a-priori* philosophical prejudice." (*Hist. of the Chr. Church*, I, p. 859.) And this is what Philippi tells them: "The furious search for discrepancies is due primarily to the wicked attitude of the moderns, which boasts of having cut out all assumptions and presuppositions (*Voraussetzungslosigkeit*); they claimed the right to cut loose from the presupposition that Holy Scripture is the Word of God. In place of that, however, they sat down in the temple of God and *presupposed that they were God*." (See Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 291.) Professor Reeve adds this: "When one makes his philosophy his authority, it is not a long step until he makes himself his own god. His own reason becomes supreme in his thinking, and this reason becomes his lord." (*Fundamentals*, III, p. 113.)

The moderns, too, as we have just seen, are apriorists. That does not in itself prove that *our a-priori* reasoning is right. But we mentioned it for two reasons. We thought it might cause them to moderate their voice a bit when they are denouncing *our* apriorism. And it gives us occasion to point out that the "assumption" that there can be no errors in the Bible differs *toto coelo* from the assumption that reason has a voice in determining the truth of a given Scripture-passage. The first is a good thing, demanded by God and created by God in us. The other is a wicked thing. It springs from the wicked pride of reason.

One more remark on the subject of the apriorism of the Bible Christian. None but a believer can take this position. We take it because the Bible assures us, and God thereby creates in us the assurance, that the Bible cannot err. One who does not believe that the Bible is God's Word and that every word of the Bible is God's truth cannot agree with us. He cannot but denounce our position as unreasonable and untenable. It is hopeless to argue with him. But we did not set out to argue with him. Our sole purpose, at the present time, is to point out to the Christian that it should be impossible for him to speak of, and think of, errors in the Bible. The vehement asseverations of the moderns to the contrary ought not to make any impression on us. The fact that they cannot grasp our argument must not lead us to doubt the certainty of our position. The attitude of the Christian must be that he meets all objections with the stubborn *a-priori* argument: The Scriptures cannot err. The professor of science may say to the Christian: "The Bible? Why, I didn't suppose that any intelligent person today believed the Bible!" "Oh, yes," answers

the Christian with assurance, "I believe it all. You see *I know the Author.*"²⁰ The skeptic cannot say that. But do not permit *his* doubts and subtleties to shake *your* assurance. Believe your beliefs — they are based on God's Word — and doubt your doubts!

The skeptic does not know what to make of such an attitude. Dr. G. A. Buttrick, president of the Federal Council for 1940, says the thing is incredible. "Probably few people who claim to 'believe every word of the Bible' really mean it. That avowal, held to its last logic, would risk a trip to the insane asylum." (*The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt*, 1935.) Well, we are of those — and they are not just a few — who believe every word of the Bible, and we really mean it. We shall say it as long as we retain our Christian sanity. Sane faith cannot speak otherwise. Faith is the product of God's Word, and "the faith produced by the Word is divinely convinced that the Word, every word of Scripture, is the divine truth" (*Conc. Theol. Monthly*, XI, p. 809).

Faith listens to the voice of God speaking through Holy Scripture. It will listen to no other voice. *It will not listen to the voice of rationalism.* It is rationalism which denies the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, and when the Christian listens to this voice, he disgraces himself.

We have already pointed out that the rationalist refuses to trust the bare word of Scripture and must necessarily take the *a-posteriori* position. Let us discuss this point more in detail. We say that the rejection of Verbal, Plenary Inspiration and the denial of the absolute inerraneousness of Scripture springs from rationalistic considerations. We say that these men set reason above Scripture. We do not have to say it. They say it themselves. The Unitarian who told us: "No statement can be accepted as true because it is in the Bible," proceeds to tell us: "All its teachings must be subjected to the authority of reason and conscience." Voltaire tells us that he cannot accept the accounts "of God's strange and supernatural dealings with the Israelites in Egypt and in the desert" because "they are revolting to reason." (See D. MacDill, *The Mosaic Authority of the Pentateuch*, p. 15.)²¹ And it is not only the Unitarian, the rationalist, and Voltaire, the scoffer, who champion the rights of reason. J. De Witt, too, insists that reason has the right to correct Scripture. "If, besides the divine truth that Scripture embodies, it also contains partial truths, which are sometimes as misleading as falsehood, and moral incongruities and monstrosities from which our souls recoil, how shall

20) Margaret Bottome gave that answer. See *Lutheran Annual*, 1941, p. 25.

21) E. Lewis: "The motto of rationalism may be said to be: 'Prove all that you believe by what you indubitably know.'" (*A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation*, p. 147.)

I separate the gold from the dross? By the use of my reason? Would you have me become a rationalist? Yes, rather than be a sophist or a simpleton, if one becomes a rationalist by making use of his reason, including conscience and every spiritual faculty with which God has endowed him, strengthened and enlightened by the word, and life, and spirit of Christ. . . . Our enlightened moral instinct rejects it" ("the old inspiration") "unreservedly and forever." (*What Is Inspiration?* P. 179 f.) The liberals say with Walter M. Horton: "To rely upon revelation apart from other truth is as bad as to rely upon prayer apart from action or upon providence apart from intelligent forethought. Revelation is no substitute for reason. If reason without revelation is blind, revelation without reason is a dazzling, unintelligible light. What Matthew Arnold said years ago about the *homo unius libri* still holds good: the man who knows only Scripture does not even know Scripture. . . . There are some ancient misunderstandings about revelation which do not seriously threaten us at present, after the debates of the last half century. We are not likely again to identify God's eternal Word with the Book which contains the record of its revealing, or to insist that everything in that Book is infallibly correct and verbally inspired. We are not likely to suppose that the authority of revelation extends into the sphere of fact and law, where natural science is supreme." (Article in *Revelation*, 1937, p. 263 f.)

Why, they even tell us that Scripture inculcates the principles of rationalism and asks us to run its statements through the crucible of reason. S. P. Cadman: "The authority of the Bible is established by divine revelation, but it is also addressed to human intelligence. The Book itself invokes finite reason and appeals to its decisions. . . . Plainly, the Scriptures do not outlaw man's judgment on their contents. Why should we do so?" (*Answers to Every-Day Questions*, p. 258.) And N. R. Best, who writes on "The Mirage of Inerrancy," gives chapter and verse for that statement. "Utterly vain is it to talk of not employing reason on the Bible. . . . When did the Creator ever brand man's reason as unholy — unfit to handle the sacred things of either His deeds or His words? . . . Every page of the Bible might be justly inscribed with the invitation which stands in living letters on the first page of the Prophet Isaiah: 'Come now and let us reason together, saith Jehovah.' Reason is God's joy — not His 'black beast.'" (*Inspiration*, p. 117 f.)

A voice from Germany. Baumgaertel: "The refusal to recognize the physical sciences" (as censor of the scientific statements of the Bible) "bars the way to the church for the educated classes. Do not ask the educated man to bring this *sacrificium intellectus*."

He cannot and must not do that." (See Moeller, *Um die Inspiration der Bibel*, p. 35.) A voice from America. R. T. Stamm, Gettysburg, calls this a "false dilemma," an "'either-or' fallacy": "either submission to the authority of the Scriptures or the assertion of the proud pretensions of human reason," and thus elaborates his thesis: "We must never forget that it is impossible to construct a systematic theology without employing the same human reason which too many of our writers have tried to deprive of all validity at the outset! And such writers are often the proudest of men, claiming to boast only in the Lord, while their self-confident assurance in the completeness and finality of their own dogmatic construction of revelation equals or excels the 'pride' of the most arrogant humanistic or communistic opponents of religion, who call upon the name of reason and modern science to justify *their* dogmatism."²² It is not a question of revelation or reason, but of revelation given, received, interpreted, and applied through the human reason which is energized and guided by the Spirit of God." (*Luth. Church Quart.*, April, 1940, pp. 124, 129.)

You cannot insult these men — those who operate in the name of reason alone and those who operate in the name of reason *and* revelation; those who appeal to plain reason and those who appeal to "enlightened" reason (see De Witt and Stamm) — by calling them rationalists. When MacDill (*op. cit.*, p. 22) says: "It is true indeed that the leaders among them [the higher critics], those who have thought out their hypotheses to their logical conclusions, are *thoroughgoing rationalists* — veritable infidels, but they prefer not to be recognized as such, at least for the present," they will take exception to "veritable infidels," but not to the phrase "thoroughgoing rationalists." They will tell him: You are right, and we are proud of the title; we only deplore that the rest of our rationalistic brethren are less consistent than we are.

This applies also to the "conservative" theologians who feel bound to reject Verbal, Plenary Inspiration because their study of science and history has convinced them that the Bible abounds in errors.²³ They are not, indeed, "thoroughgoing rationalists."

22) We might have omitted this sentence as not touching our immediate subject. But we wanted to give Dr. Stamm a chance to tell us as plainly as he could what he thinks of the *a-priori* theologians, the verbalists.

23) See pertinent statements in the preceding article. Here are some more: "Isolated facts in the statements of Scripture must be corrected by science." (E. Brunner, *The Mediator*, p. 167.) "With the sacred historians the record of fact as fact and apart from its significance in the unfolding of the divine purpose is something very secondary and subordinate. . . . I know of nothing which should isolate them" (these narratives) "and prevent us from judging them as we should other similar narratives." (W. Sanday, *The Oracles of God*, p. 68 f.) — It is sometimes most difficult to decide where to draw the line between "conservative" and liberal theologians.

They do not find as many errors as the plain-reason men and the enlightened-reason men. But they apply the same basic principle. They permit science and history (their knowledge of science and history) and *their* judgment of what is right and proper to correct Scripture. But that is a form of rationalism. We might even say that it is the heart of the creed of rationalism. The case of the conservatives is correctly diagnosed in a letter written by a theologian in Germany to one of them: "You point to contradictions which you cannot solve with your reason, acknowledging at the same time that you realize the limitations of your knowledge. I am in the same case. . . . You take, in spite of the fact that you recognize the limitations and insufficiency of your knowledge, a *rationalistic position*; I, because I dare not trust the judgment of my limited reason in divine matters, submit to the judgment of my Lord and Master Jesus Christ. With you it is a matter of reason, with me a matter of faith." (See *Lehre und Wehre*, 69, p. 305.) Pieper also diagnoses it as a case of the rationalistic disease (*op. cit.*, p. 295). So does M'Intosh: "All theories of indefinite erroneousness legitimately tend to, and naturally end in, rationalism, or the supremacy of reason over revelation. . . . I know that many who hold the less pronounced views of the erroneousness of Scripture will strongly object to be in this respect classified with avowed rationalists and infidels. . . . Nevertheless, it is shown that, however much they may differ from these in many important matters and though they hold with us the core of the Christian faith, yet in this vital and radical matter, which underlies all the other matters, there is no essential difference; that *they are all radically the same in their rationalistic principle*; and that there is no possible resting-place for any clear and thoroughgoing mind between holding the thorough truthfulness, entire trustworthiness, and divine authority of all Scripture and holding explicitly or implicitly the supremacy of reason over revelation." (*Op. cit.*, pp. 29, 38.)

And here is Walther's diagnosis: "If the possibility that Scripture contained the least error were admitted, it would become the business of *man* to sift the truth from the error. . . . The least deviation from the old inspiration doctrine introduces a *rationalistic germ* into theology and infects the whole body of doctrine." (*Walther and the Church*, p. 14.)

"If the *possibility* that Scripture contained the least error were admitted . . ." — that leads us to examine the theological principle of those theologians who are ready to admit that Scripture contains no known error but are reluctant to teach that Scripture *cannot possibly contain* errors. Those theologians who carry around with them long or short lists of alleged errors in Scripture are badly

infected with rationalism. But those theologians, too, who find themselves unable to teach the absolute inerrancy of Scripture in all of its statements until science and history, etc., have demonstrated the truth of all of these statements, are suffering with rationalism, with incipient rationalism.

There are theologians, of the conservative group, who refuse to say that Scripture cannot possibly make erroneous statements. We have already mentioned the case of Philippi, who at one time said: "One dare not from the outset refuse to grant the possibility of the occurrence of minor discrepancies." O. Bensow: "We do not know of a single case where it has been conclusively shown that an error has crept in, while we do know of many cases where the alleged error was proved to be the truth." But he adds: "In these peripheral regions errors *might possibly* have occurred, due to the fact that the writers retained their human auto-activity." (*Die Bibel—das Wort Gottes.*) Meusel: "Most of the alleged contradictions and errors may be and have been solved. But a small residuum remains which makes it impossible for us to maintain, after the aprioristic-absolute manner of our old dogmaticians, the literal inerrancy of Scripture and to say: *Nullus error vel in leviculis*. . . . If it should be shown that a geographical mistake had been made or that Matthew's memory was at fault (27:9), that would not destroy the divine and inspired nature of Holy Scripture." (*Kirchl. Handlex., s. v. Irrtumslosigkeit.*) W. Sanday speaks in a similar strain: "If it should be proved that the Law, as we have it, was not written by Moses or that the 110th Psalm was not written by David. . . ." (*Op. cit.*, p. 109.)²⁴

"If it should be shown . . .!" These men are living in constant fear that the inerrancy of Scripture might be disproved—by whom? By the scientists and the historians and the philosophers, etc. They are afraid that Scripture cannot hold its own against human scholarship and wisdom. And so they look to human scholarship to *establish* the claim of Scripture to plenary inerrancy. There is something else besides Scripture on which they base their belief in the truthfulness of Scripture, and basing it on the findings of science and the assent of reason is—subtle rationalism. The *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference*, Dec., 1938, says: "How can we know the human framework of the Bible is true—the history, the geography, the biography, the science . . . ?

24) H. McIntosh, too, shies at "absolute inerrancy." "That most extreme and unwarrantable, if not unintelligible, title 'the absolute inerrancy' of Scripture"; "the narrow, negative, and at least questionable ground of absolute inerrancy" (*op. cit.*, pp. 14, 442). At the same time he declares: "Even the extremest position of absolute inerrancy is not destitute of an apology, and may offer a valid and apparently irrefutable defense." (P. 21.)

We not only may but we must study these things critically, *to see if the Bible statements are supported or contradicted by known facts from other sources. . . .* It is my growing conviction that it is possible to arrive at a *reasonable* faith in the substantial truthfulness of the human framework of the Bible." (Italics ours.) This Lutheran theologian is not satisfied with the bare statement of Scripture. His faith calls upon critical investigation and human wisdom to help out the Bible. He wants a "reasonable" faith. (See *Conc. Theol. Mthly.*, XI, p. 812.) This is certainly a rationalistic aberration. Men who admit the possibility of errors in Scripture and thus make it the business of man to sift the truth from error and to establish the truth of Scripture are, as Walther said, introducing a rationalistic germ into theology. It is a case of incipient rationalism. If that is not checked, it will develop into the virulent form.

It is rationalism which, as we have shown, denies the absolute inerrancy of Scripture and its corollary, Verbal, Plenary Inspiration. And now we say: When the Christian listens to the voice of rationalism, he disgraces himself. It is unworthy of the Christian to have dealings with such a wicked thing as rationalism.

The wickedness consists, first, in this, that rationalism is engaged in a criminal business. Scripture has outlawed its business. God's Word commands us to "bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5) and to accept Scripture, every statement of Scripture, as God's truth, as authoritative and binding. Carnal reason, however, refuses to do this. It claims supreme authority for its own judgments. It assumes the right to criticize and correct Scripture. And the Christian should find it impossible to listen to the voice of rationalism for one moment. The Christian stands in holy awe of Scripture, the Word of his God and Savior, and shudders at the bare thought of speaking one word against it. He loves Scripture, in which he has eternal life, and burns in holy wrath against those who call its truthfulness in question. When Satan asks him to forsake Scripture and follow reason, he cries out: How can I do this great wickedness and keep company with "Satan's paramour" (Luther, XX:232)? The Christian will not be seen in the company of her who speaks in dishonor of Holy Scripture. If he listens to such a voice, he dishonors himself.

Hear Walther again: "If the possibility that Scripture contained the least error were admitted, it would become the business of man to sift the truth from the error. That places man over Scripture. . . . Human reason is made the *norma* of truth, and *Scripture is degraded* to the position of a *norma normata*." Carnal reason delights in degrading Scripture. And the Christian, who

trembles at God's Word, is horrified when he finds that his flesh, too, holds Scripture in derision.

The Christian should find it impossible to listen to these criticisms and corrections of Scripture because, in the second place, they spring from carnal pride. Pride, arrogance, conceit, is a wicked thing at all times, under any form. That already is wicked pride when men, because of their superiority, real or fancied, speak contemptuously of the others. But when they assume the right to criticize and correct Scripture, they have reached the limit of conceit and arrogance. We shall not say much of the former case. We can easily bear it when these men look down upon us as pre-Kantian obscurantists and call us verbalists, who, as De Witt puts it, cannot take an "*intelligent view of inspiration*" (*op. cit.*, p. 17). We cannot bear it so well when he speaks contemptuously of "the Reformers, who knew nothing of the refinements of exegetical science" (p. 18).²⁵ But we cannot bear it at all when, in speaking of the Old Testament writers, he says: "We, who have attained *higher forms* in the world-wide schoolroom of the great Instructor of men" (p. 182).

That is insufferable conceit, wickedness beyond expression, when men presume to censor, revise, rectify and improve Scripture. De Witt and all the other critics, liberal and conservative, claim to know more about certain things than the Biblical writers. But what does that mean? Assuming the right to correct Scripture, that, says Walther, "places man over Scripture."²⁶ And that really means, it places man over — God. The critics may repudiate this charge on the plea that they have found that these portions of Scripture which they eliminate are *not* God's Word. But God is telling them that every word of Scripture is His word; and

25) The judgment of Dr. H. R. Mackintosh is not quite so coarse, but equally unacceptable. "It does not seem as if the Reformers (who had many other pressing questions to work at) quite realized where the new evangelical thought of Scripture was to lead or what it implied for exact Biblical study. . . . It ought to be said frankly that Luther often clings to the older notion of a verbally inspired Bible. He actually speaks of the Holy Spirit as the *Author* of the books of Moses; he submitted his judgment undoubtingly to Scriptural statements on points of natural science. . . . The same is true of Calvin. . . . This was obviously bound to lead to conclusions which in a Christian writer are strange and unwelcome." (Written for *The Doctrine of the Infallible Book*, by Charles Gore, p. 58.)

26) Walther again, as quoted in *Proceedings, Iowa District, 1897*, p. 36: "The eighth thesis of Superintendent Kier emphatically states that 'it has not pleased God to perform the miracle of having His witnesses speak and write inerrantly.' It thus asserts that what the prophets and apostles preached was shot through with errors and — oh, what Satanic pride! — that the preachments of the moderns which separate the pure Word of God in Scripture from — what blasphemy! — the rubbish, are much better than the discourses of the prophets and apostles."

whether they believe it or not, it remains God's Word, and whether they realize it or not, they are disputing the truth of God's Word. They are setting themselves above God. "Self-deification" — that is a hard saying. But here strong words have to be used. Philippi used them: "They presupposed that they were God." Professor Reeve used them: "When one makes his philosophy his authority, it is not a long step until he makes himself his own god." M'Intosh used them. Speaking of "the old and fatal issues of the common rationalistic principle, namely, that every varying man must become a judge and authoritative standard himself"; he says: "Having got rid of an infallible Bible and an infallible Christ, he must reach the supreme absurdity — an infallible self, 'Lord of himself that heritage of woe,' as Byron says" (*op. cit.*, p. 32), self-deification. What we say about these men is what they say about themselves. The old rationalist Loeffler said: "Our reason is manifestly God in us." (See *Conc. Theol. Mthly.*, XI, p. 322.) The First Unitarian Church in Cleveland said on its bulletin-board: "Man is greater than any of the Scriptures." (See *Lutheran Witness*, LX, p. 5.) And if you say that a certain statement of Scripture is not true because your knowledge of science says so, you are committing self-deification. Can a Christian, in his sober mind, declare that a certain statement of Scripture contains a discrepancy because his knowledge of science says so?

Now, self-conceited pride and Christianity do not go together. The spirit of the Christian is humble. Particularly in dealing with Scripture, he effaces himself. He is nothing; Scripture is everything. If he cannot solve a contradiction, it does not take him long to put the blame on his ignorance. If he cannot square Scripture with science, he puts the blame on his ignorance and the ignorance of the learned scientist. Augustine was a humble Christian and said: "If I come across a passage which seems to conflict with the truth, I do not doubt for a moment that either the copyist or the translator made a mistake or that *I may not have understood the matter*. It would be a sin to have doubts respecting the inerrancy of the apostles and prophets." (Quoted in Moeller, *op. cit.*, p. 56. See also Luther, XV:1481.) Luther was a humble Christian and declared: "When Moses writes that God made heaven and earth and all that is in them in six days, let the six days stand. . . . If you cannot understand how it could have been six days" (or how the ax-head could float or the fish swallow Jonah), "then accord to the Holy Spirit the honor that He is more learned than you." (III, p. 21.) Luther was a humble Christian; and when he found that he could not straighten out the chronology of Scripture on a certain point ("Bei Abraham verlieren sich sechzig Jahre"), he would not side with "those rash men who in the case of a Bible

difficulty are not afraid to say that Scripture is evidently wrong," but said: "I conclude the matter with a humble confession of my ignorance, for it is only the Holy Ghost who knows and understands everything." (I:721.) God looks for such an attitude in the Christians. Philip Schaff: "The holy awe of Scripture, the sense of its awful majesty (which we more or less miss in the entire Schleiermacher-school) requires that in cases where our knowledge is not able to clear up the difficulty we humbly bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." (*Geschichte der Apostolischen Kirche*. See Pieper, *op. cit.*, p. 294.) James Bannermann: The rationalist "comes to the Bible and sits over its contents in the attitude of a judge who is to decide for himself what in it is true and worthy to be believed, . . . not in the attitude of the disciple who within the limits of the inspired record feels himself at Jesus' feet to receive every word that cometh out of His mouth." (See B. Manly, *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration*, p. 16.) Which attitude will you take?

When a man charges Scripture with unsolvable contradictions and errors, put that down to his self-conceit. It is the part of Christian humility to put the failure to solve the Bible difficulties down to your own limitations and insufficiencies. Long ago Origen said: "If ever, in reading the Scriptures, you happen to stumble on some thought which becomes to thee a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense, *blame none but thyself*; doubt not that this stone of stumbling and rock of offense has some great meaning. . . . When you have been unable to find the reason for that which is written, blame not the holy letters; lay the blame on thyself alone." (See L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, p. 327 f.)

De Witt cries out: "Would you have me become a rationalist? Yes, rather than be a simpleton." Luther declares: "We must become fools, complete fools (simpletons) in Christ." (XVIII:39.) The Christian, in his sober mind, declares himself for Luther, against the rationalist. He is not ashamed of being a simpleton in the eyes of the wise philosopher. He is ashamed of the foolish pride of his rationalizing flesh.

The Christian cannot bear to hear men talking about the mistakes in the Bible, for, in the third place, he is a believer and the talk about the mistakes in the Bible is plain unbelief. Unbelief — that is a harsh word. Indeed it is; it denotes the greatest crime of which man is capable. But this talk about being unable to accept Verbal, Plenary Inspiration because of suspected errors in the Bible is the voice of unbelief, plain, common unbelief. When the rationalist Harnack declares that he cannot and will not believe that the sun stood still, and when the rationalist Fosdick declares that he finds some of the miracle-narratives of Scripture

historically incredible (see preceding article), conservative theologians are horrified at such ebullitions of unbelief. But when these same conservatives insist that they have found many discrepancies and erroneous statements in the Bible and therefore cannot believe, teach, and confess that all Scripture is given by inspiration, they, too, are, on this point, rationalists, unbelievers. Scripture plainly states that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God." *They* say: Not all of Scripture is inspired. This particular statement we cannot believe. Scripture states: "Scripture cannot be broken." No, no; we cannot believe that statement to its full extent. "Thy Word is truth." Not absolutely and in all respects, say the conservative rationalists. A thousand times Scripture says that the writings of the prophets and apostles are God's own Word. And the conservative rationalists say a thousand times that they can no longer, at this time and age, teach verbalism. Are they, on this point, believers or unbelievers?

How often must God say a thing so as to get men to say the same thing? Can God say more plainly than He has said that God spoke by and through the prophets and that the Holy Spirit gave the apostles utterance? And when the rationalists say that they cannot accept Verbal Inspiration, could they say more plainly that they are, on this point, unbelievers? Prof. James B. Green says: "The Law and the Prophets, the teaching of Jesus and the preaching of Paul, these are declared to be the Word of God. It has been estimated that the Bible in various ways asserts its own inspiration some three thousand times. How often does the Bible have to say a thing before men will believe it?" (*Studies in the Holy Spirit*, p. 49. See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 97, p. 417.)

Luther cries out in holy wrath: "But it is cursed unbelief (der verfluchte Unglaube) and the odious flesh which will not permit us to see and know that God speaks to us in Scripture and that it is God's Word, but tells us that it is the word merely of Isaiah, Paul, or some other mere man, who has not created heaven and earth." (IX:1800.) And the Christian is filled with dismay when his flesh urges him to criticize Scripture and reject certain statements as incredible. How can the believer bring himself to accept the findings of rationalism, of unbelief? Here are two warring, irreconcilable principles. How can faith make appeasement with unbelief? The ideology of rationalism, which sits in judgment on God's Word and refuses to accept what some scientists tell us not to accept, is incompatible with the attitude of faith, which bows to Scripture and believes though it does not see. Let the rationalist conjure the believer by all that holy science and holy philosophy stands for, the believer should say and will finally say: "I believe *all* things which are written in the Law and the Prophets," Acts 24:14.

Unbelief is, in truth, the sin of sins, odious to God and odious to the Christian. "Let us ever bear in mind that every one who denies the inspiration of Scripture is *eo ipso* a critic of Scripture, and one who criticizes Scripture — which, as God's Word, will not be criticized but *believed* — comes under the fearful judgment of God described in Matt. 11:25." "The same faith and obedience that is due to God is due to Scripture in all that it says. He who rejects or even only criticizes Scripture insults the Majesty of God. He is committing a *crimen laesae majestatis divinae*." (Pieper, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 280, 371.)

All objections to the divine inspiration and the inerrancy of Scripture are unworthy of a Christian.

TH. ENGELDER

(To be continued)

Modern Humanism¹⁾

"Humanism," in the words of Walter Lippmann, "to replace the conception of man as the subject of a heavenly King takes as its dominant pattern the progress of the individual from helpless infancy to self-governing maturity."²⁾ Modern Humanism has been labeled as scientific or literary or philosophic humanism and more recently as Religious Humanism. Humanism parades under the name of religion and claims to be "a cult or belief calling itself religious but substituting faith in man for faith in God." C. F. Potter, an exponent of so-called Religious Humanism, defines it as "faith in the supreme value and self-perfectibility of human personality." In the words of Prof. E. E. Aubrey the Religious Humanists endeavor to emancipate "religion from a theism which obstructs the full exercise of man's courage and initiative for human improvement."³⁾ According to Prof. J. Auer a humanist does not necessarily deny the existence of God, but he will insist that a true religious experience is possible without the belief in God in the theistic sense.⁴⁾ Humanism is the rankest kind of rationalism. In the final analysis there is little practical difference

1) The material in this article is essentially the same as that presented in a series of lectures on "Modern Isms" at pastors' institutes in 1940.

2) Webster's *New International Dictionary*.

3) Aubrey, *Present Theological Tendencies*, 1936, pp. 167, 174n.

4) *Humanism States Its Case*, 1933, pp. 79, 80, quoted in Dakin, *Man the Measure, an Essay on Humanism as a Religion*, 1939, p. 20. Incidentally the title of Dakin's book is significant, for the motto of all humanists is: Man is the measure and standard of all truth. Dakin offers an exhaustive study and a keen analysis of every significant phase of Humanism.

between humanism and naturalism. It is true that exponents of humanism like Norman Foerster claim that humanism is a vigorous protest against naturalism. They say that humanism does not begin with nature but with man, that humanism grants to man as an autonomous being the right to seek those things which in his opinion constitute a normal, rich, exalted, beautiful life, whereas naturalism views man merely as an automaton caught in the clutches of the inexorable laws of nature. But, after all, there is little difference between modern Scientific Naturalism and Religious Humanism; the one is an apotheosis of nature; the other, of human nature.⁵⁾ Dr. H. S. Coffin, in his commencement address at Union Theological Seminary in 1929, warned against humanism because it "makes 'God' simply a name for the ethical ideal evolved by mankind and attempts to draw its moral standards from a study of human behavior."⁶⁾ Humanism regards theistic religion as the most active menace to civilization and considers its anthropocentric philosophy as the only hope of the world.

Humanism reached the peak of its popularity about 1930. Since then the high-class magazines have discussed it increasingly less. The only school of humanists which endeavored to effect some sort of an organization are the Religious Humanists.⁷⁾ The majority of Religious Humanists are Unitarians. It seems that this movement resembles Unitarianism not only in its tenets but also in its sterility. L. Mercier, professor of philosophy at Harvard, said recently that humanism is dying. In 1933 more than 30 men, professors of sociology and philosophy, Unitarian ministers, authors, ethical culturists, and others published *A Humanist Manifesto*.⁸⁾ This manifesto did not create the stir which its authors anticipated.

5) Norman Foerster, *Humanism and Religion*; *Forum*, Sept. 1929, p. 150. See also *Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Jan. 1939, p. 55 ff. J. W. Krutch, *The Paradox of Humanism*. *The Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1927, p. 756 ff.

6) *Forum*, Sept. 1929, p. 146.

7) The Humanist Press Association, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, was organized by a number of Unitarian ministers and professors of philosophy. According to newspaper reports of recent meetings the objective of this group at present is to popularize Religious Humanism.

8) "The time has come for wide-spread recognition of the radical changes in religious beliefs throughout the modern world. The time is past for mere revision of traditional attitudes. Science and economic change have disrupted the old beliefs. Religions the world over are under the necessity of coming to terms with new conditions created by a vastly increased knowledge and experience. In every field of human activity the vital movement is now in the direction of a candid and explicit humanism. In order that Religious Humanism may be better understood, we, the undersigned, desire to make certain affirmations which, we believe, the facts of our contemporary life demonstrate.

"Today man's larger understanding of the universe, his scientific achievements, and his deeper appreciation of brotherhood have created

a situation which requires a new statement of the means and purposes of religion. Such a vital, fearless, and frank religion capable of furnishing adequate social goals and personal satisfactions may appear to many people as a complete break with the past. While this age does owe a vast debt to the traditional religions, it is none the less obvious that any religion that can hope to be a synthesizing and dynamic force for today must be shaped for the needs of the present age. To establish such a religion is a major necessity of the present. It is a responsibility which rests upon this generation. We therefore affirm the following:

"1. Religious Humanists regard the universe as self-existing, not created.

"2. Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as the result of a continuous process.

"3. Holding an organic view of life, humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected.

"4. Man's religious culture and civilization, as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and social heritage. The individual of a particular culture is molded by that culture.

"5. The nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values. Humanism insists that the way to determine the existence and value of all realities is by intelligent inquiry and by the assessment of their relation to human needs. Religion must formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method.

"6. The time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of 'new thought.'

"7. Religion consists of those actions, purposes, and experiences which are humanly significant. Nothing human is alien to the religious. It includes labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation—all that is expressive of intelligently satisfying human living. The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained.

"8. Religious Humanism considers the complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now. This explains the humanist's social passion.

"9. In place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being.

"10. It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural.

"11. Man will learn to face the crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly attitudes will be fostered by education. Humanism will take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking.

"12. Believing that religion must work increasingly for joy in living, Religious Humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life.

"13. Religious Humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods, and communal activities must be reconstituted in order to function effectively in the modern world.

"14. The humanists are firmly convinced that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society is inadequate and that a radical change in methods, controls, and motives must be instituted. A socialized and cooperative economic order must be established for the equitable dis-

Modern humanism must not be confused with the Humanism of an Erasmus, Petrarch, Colet. Rather, it is more closely related to such ethnic religions as Confucianism and Buddhism. Irving Babbitt, the outstanding literary humanist, turned to Primitive Buddhism, or Hinayana, as is evident from a posthumous essay published in 1936, *The Dhammapada*.⁹⁾ Modern humanism resembles Greek sophism, which endeavored to produce individual goodness through cooperative human endeavor. Humanism is very closely related to Modernism, in fact, the two have frequently been identified. Theoretically Modernism professes to be theistic and opposed to the materialistic implications and non-theistic (*i. e.*, atheistic) preachments of humanism. In reality, however, the chasm between the two is not very deep nor very wide, and a number of Modernists have conveniently transferred to the other side. The Modernist D. C. Macintosh speaks of the humanists as "Christian *mutilés*"; W. A. Brown says that the "Christian" shares with the humanist the conviction that man is fully competent to become what he ought to be; and Shailer Mathews sees little in the message of humanism which differs from the social gospel of the Modernist, except that the humanist substitutes human capacity for God.¹⁰⁾

Essentially there is little difference between the views of the various humanists. They are usually divided into two schools, the Columbia group, under the leadership of John Dewey, and the Chicago school, under E. S. Ames. The division offered by Elias Andrews adapts itself to our purposes, and we shall follow it because it presents a rather comprehensive view of the aims of humanism.¹¹⁾

1. *Philosophic Humanism* is based on the philosophy of John Dewey and F. C. Schiller, that knowing and doing go hand in hand. There can therefore be no rigid tenets about any truth; in fact, the only certain thing in life is constant change. All intellectual and moral values are dependent entirely upon what men do. There are no eternal standards, for the good is never the same. All

tribution of the means of life. The goal of humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently cooperate for the common good. Humanists demand a shared life in a shared world.

"15. Humanism will (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from it; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few."

Included in the list of signers are: John Dewey, E. A. Haydon, E. H. Barnes, Maynard Shipley, H. Randall, Jr., R. W. Sellars, J. J. Weinstein.

9) T. S. Eliot, in Baillie and Martin, *Revelation*, p. 16 ff.

10) The references are to *Humanism, Another Battle Line*, edited by Wm. P. King and containing essays by ten well-known Modernists.

11) Elias Andrews, *Modern Humanism and Christian Theism*, 1939, Grand Rapids.

moral values arise out of action, out of the constant intercourse among men. So-called religion is only the idealizing of the present social and moral standards. "Religion, then, for Dewey cuts itself off altogether from any relationship to a supernatural world and finds in human life and experience the ground for everything that is worthy; in short, Pragmatism and Positivism unite to produce antitheistic humanism."¹² The gist of Dewey's humanism is: By a cooperative human endeavor, without any supernatural intervention, man and society will ultimately reach perfection.¹³ Man's conduct is the standard of morality.

2. *Scientific Humanism* takes the position that through science man will control the forces of nature which "primitive man" feared and which he deified. Man has increasingly gained control of the universe through inventions which reduce, as it were, space and time, which enable man to lower the death-rate, etc. Science will ultimately enable man to dismiss the concept of the supernatural entirely from his vocabulary and to place the salvation of the individual and the race entirely into man's own hands. As man controls the physical world, so he also alone will determine the cultural and moral standards.

"As a frank naturalist physical systems are for me ultimate, and I have seen no reason to postulate an extraphysical *nisus*. Nature is for me intrinsically dynamic."¹⁴

"Men and women must realize that the future is in their hands, that they have the power to acquire and apply knowledge so as to control disease, prevent children from being born to misery through defective heredity, regulate population and, in a word, help to control the way in which civilization and the human species is to evolve."¹⁵

Scientific Humanism, however, is compelled to lament with Elmer More: "If only we were sure of attaining happiness on the human level!" Fatalism and pessimism are the inevitable goals to which this kind of humanism will lead. Witness Bertrand Russell:

"That man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they were achieving; that his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental allocations of atoms; that no fire, no heroism, no intensity of thought and feeling, can preserve an individual life beyond the grave; that all the labors of the ages are destined to extinction in the vast death of the solar system; and that the whole temple of man's achievement

12) Andrews, l. c., p. 70.

13) John Dewey, *The Common Faith*, pp. 26, 32, 56 f.

14) Personal statement of R. W. Sellars in *Contemporary American Philosophy*, 1930, II, p. 277.

15) J. S. Huxley, *Religion without Revelation*, p. 371; quoted in Andrews, l. c., 87.

must inevitably be buried beneath the debris of the universe in ruins,—all these things, if not quite beyond dispute, are yet so nearly certain, that no philosophy which rejects them can hope to stand. Only within the scaffolding of these truths, only on the firm foundation of unyielding despair [??], can the soul's habitation henceforth be safely built."¹⁶⁾

3. *Psychological Humanism* is based on behaviorism and psychoanalysis, claiming that all tendencies which determine behavior can be analyzed and that human behavior can be explained in terms of biological value. Freud considered the *libido* (a polite word for passion) the determining factor in man's behavior and claimed that all behavior was conditioned by a repression of the *libido* in early life. The Psychological humanist explains the father-child relation in religion, the theological terms of Father, Lord, King, etc., merely as projections to suit the needs of man. The Christian concepts of God are merely expressions of human instincts and inherent powers. Jung believes that, if the *libido*, the *élan vital*, the conative energy, is properly directed, man is able to reach illimitable heights. He says:

"If one honors God, the sun, or the fire, then one honors one's own vital force, the *libido*. . . . God is our longing, to which we pay divine honors. . . . The *libido* can enforce a standard of accomplishment that would be unattainable to conscious effort. . . . God is the *optimum* of psychological activity. . . . God is a psychological function of man."¹⁷⁾

4. *Literary Humanism* is predicated on the theory that good literature is the standard of man's behavior. Since the death of its two outstanding exponents, Irving Babbitt and Paul E. More, Literary Humanism is virtually a thing of the past. These humanists viewed man as possessed of a higher and lower nature, the former the controlling factor. By intuition, imaginative insight, by inner discipline, self-restraint (the veto power, *frein vital*, *Entsagung*), man can so emulate the great models of antiquity that he ultimately reaches individual happiness.¹⁸⁾ Babbitt's philosophy was orientated in Buddhism and his *frein vital* reminds one very forcibly of Oriental royal yoga.

5. *Religious Humanism* makes of religion a worship of the spirit of humanity. Man's spirit is the most exalted reality, and it alone is worthy of worship. The kingdom of God must make room for the kingdom of man. The only excuse for denominating this type of humanism as *religious* is that man, having been

16) *A Free Man's Worship*; Traveller's Library, p.1295 f., quoted in Andrews, l. c., 92.

17) *Psychological Types*, p. 300; *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 38. Quoted by Dakin, l. c., 138, 142.

18) Phil. S. Richards, *Irving Babbitt, a New Humanism; The Nineteenth Century*, April, 1928, p. 433 ff.

placed into the center of the universe, is given the honor and glory which religion offers to the Supreme Being. A few samples from the writings of so-called Religious Humanists will show that they ascribe to man the ability to "build a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven," Gen. 11:4. Dr. John Dietrich, pastor emeritus of the Unitarian Society at Minneapolis and author of many published lectures on humanism, writes:

"Humanism considers human life an end in itself and teaches that everything in life should contribute to the glory of men rather than the glory of God.—There is no power outside of man himself that fashions individual character and human society. Humanism takes humanity and glorifies and idealizes it with the attributes of God."¹⁹⁾

Prof. A. E. Haydon, professor of history of religions at the University of Chicago, holds that we must renounce the escape mechanism of a kingdom of heaven and establish a rule of justice and goodness on earth. Though Utopias are outmoded, man must meet natural evil, such as disease, death, with science, and social or individual evil with adjustment of personal relations.²⁰⁾ Walter Lippmann:

"When men can no longer be theists, they must, if they are civilized, become humanists. It is to a morality of humanism that men must turn when the ancient order of things dissolves. When they find that they no longer believe seriously and deeply that they are governed from heaven, there is anarchy in their souls until by conscious effort they find ways of governing themselves."²¹⁾

E. S. Ames, of the philosophy department at the University of Chicago and minister in the Disciples Church:

"When once the natural history of religion in human experience is understood, religion might then consciously develop ideologies in place of social creeds, social values and ideals in place of supernatural commands, dramatic ceremonials in place of ordinances and sacraments, and reasonably planned social institutions instead of apocalyptic visions."²²⁾

The Unitarian C. W. Reese, who is president of the Humanist Press Association, is quoted by Edwin H. Wilson as saying:

"The theocratic view of the world is autocratic; the humanistic is democratic and holds that this is man's world and that it largely depends on man what the world order shall be like. The chief end of men is to promote man's welfare here and now."²³⁾

19) *My Idea of God*, p. 186 ff. Quoted in Andrews, l. c., p. 56.

20) Dakin, l. c., p. 154. See also Ivan Lee Holt's summary of Haydon Humanism in King, *Humanism*, l. c., p. 115.

21) *A Preface to Morals*, p. 137 f.; quoted in Andrews, l. c., p. 74.

22) *Christianity and Scientific Thinking; Journal of Religion*, 1934, p. 11.

23) Quoted in Dakin, l. c., p. 153.

Religious Humanism is the acme of a this-worldly religion; for in the words of E. H. Wilson, to a reporter of the *Chicago Tribune* concerning the aims of the Humanist Press Association, humanists

"are not atheists. We have no quarrel with any religion. We are merely trying to infiltrate our belief of the supremacy of human personality into all religions. We see no conflict."

The Christian has no difficulty in cataloguing humanism with those systems which St. Paul condemns in Col. 2:8. Humanism, however, is so shallow that it is condemned also in the light of reason.

1. Humanism is not *scientific*. The premise of the humanists that the social, economic, cultural, and moral problems will be solved by science is unscientific. In his analysis of humanism Dakin correctly asserts that "in humanistic writings scientific cant plays roughly the same persuasive and corrupting role that commercial advertising does in ordinary life. The phrase 'scientifically approved' acts as an opiate."²⁴ The humanist's science is merely a preconceived, subjective opinion. There is no basis for the claim that man cannot be concerned about those things which are beyond the field of cause and effect. *Bona-fide* scientists are agreed that there are many spiritual and intangible values which cannot be investigated with laboratory tubes. The unscientific method of humanists becomes very patent in the claims which they base on psychology. First of all, psychology is not a science, and furthermore, the investigations of men like W. Schmidt in the field of anthropology show that evolution in the field of religion is disproved by the existence of fundamental monotheism in the earliest times.²⁵ As scientists humanists are self-contradictory; for on the one hand, they say that modern science has shown us that man and our planet are but a small and insignificant part of the universe, that "man is only a sick fly on the dizzy wheel of the cosmic universe" (H. L. Mencken) and "only a highly temporary episode on a most petty planet" (H. E. Barnes), and, on the other hand, humanists have all but deified man.²⁶

2. Humanism is *irrational*. It is not only unfair but an irrational method to direct their destructive attacks against the Church without having the least conception of the nature and

24) Dakin, l. c., p. 103.

25) See the review of Wilhelm Schmidt's two recent books, *Primitive Revelation* and *Culture-Historical Method of Ethnology*, in the *Cresset*, Jan. 1941, pp. 48-50. Cf. also Zwemer, *The Origin of Religion*. W. J. Blyton, *Where Humanism Breaks Down*; *The Hibbert Journal*, July, 1929, p. 620 ff.

26) Cf. *Introduction to Sociology*, Davis, Barnes, and others, Book I, chap. VII.

function of the Church. They draw a caricature of the Church and then ridicule the caricature; they set up a straw man in order to knock him down. Furthermore, humanists are irrational because they speak of their system as a religion without its having an object of worship. Or is humanism *autolatry*? If God is no more than the sum of perfected human attributes, then, of course, humanism worships human character as God. That probably explains the prayer spoken in Dr. Ames's church:

"O Thou Objectification of our highest ideals! O Thou Projection of our sublimated *libido*! O Thou Symbol of the highest social values! O Thou Personification, Idealization, and Glorification of the world, including humanity! O Thou Wish-Being! O Thou Substantiated Abstraction!"²⁷⁾

3. Humanism is immoral. If there is no God, no hereafter, if life is essentially *change*, then there can be no standard of morality nor an incentive leading toward morality. All moral standards are subject to constant change, since they are only subjective creations. Whether an action is right or wrong depends entirely on one's personal viewpoint. The whole immoral tenor to which humanism must inevitably lead is expressed in the frequently quoted words of Bertrand Russell:

"Outside human desires there is no moral standard. In the absence of children sexual relations are a purely private matter, which does not concern either the state or the neighbors."

Have humanists not read history? When the Roman philosophers instructed people to laugh at their idols, the morality soon disappeared and with it — the empire.

Humanism's best efforts can take man only into the "cosmic chill of godless space and time." J. W. Krutch, an advocate of humanism, is suspicious of his system and urges that somehow man should strive for absolute standards. And Paul More thought that humanism's chain was perfect, link by link; only at the end it seemed to be attached to — nothing.

F. E. MAYER

27) Quoted in King, l. c., p. 62.

Outlines on the Wuertemberg Gospel Selections

Third Sunday after Easter

Matt. 10:16-20

Jesus never failed to prepare His disciples for events that would cut deeply into their lives, *e. g.*, Luke 18:31-33; John 16; Luke 22:31-34, *et al.* He not only foretold what would happen but also gave them directions and imparted comfort. In our text we find

Jesus Preparing His Disciples for the Dark Days Ahead of Them

1. *He tells them that persecutions will surely come*
2. *He gives them directions for their conduct in time of persecution*
3. *He supplies them with precious comfort for the days of persecution*

1

V. 16—18. Why? V. 16: "I send you forth," not for the purpose of being maltreated and torn asunder. They are His emissaries, who proclaim Him as the only Savior from sin. Their message will be unpopular. They will be hated for His name's sake, vv. 18, 22. Since their enemies cannot reach Jesus with their animosity, they will turn it against His messengers of salvation. — Has this prediction been fulfilled? Indeed! Acts 4:1-3, 17-21a; 5:17, 18, 40; 6:8-15; 7:54, 57-59; 12:1-5; 13:50; 14:19; 16:19-23; 17:5-9, *et al.* Nearly all apostles suffered death by violence. The persecutions of the early Christians.

Have you never suffered the taunts of worldlings? If not, it is time to take stock of your Christianity. As long as you merely go to church and confess a colorless religion, speak of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, of Christ as the greatest Teacher of morality and the outstanding example of righteous living, you may enjoy even the acclaim of the world. (*Witness*, 1941, 36: "Newspaper Religion.") But Christians are to be fearless witnesses for the Christ of the Bible. Tell an individual that he is lost in sin and can find salvation only in Christ; refuse to unite in worship with other religionists. What will be the result? Raillery, opposition. (*Witness*, 1941, 36: "The Unfairness of the Unbeliever.")

How did Christ's prediction prepare the disciples, and how does it prepare us? Neither they nor we should be overtaken unawares, 1 Pet. 4:12. To be forewarned is to be forearmed. And Christ forearms us by giving directions for proper conduct in times of persecution.

2

V. 16. "Wise as serpents." A serpent is wary, on the alert against danger, silently glides away at the approach of danger. In what way are Christians to take the serpents as an example? Refrain from witnessing for Christ if there is only a possibility of opposition or even persecution? No. Matt. 10:32, 33. The apostles so understood it and went into the very lairs of the wolves. They would not be silenced, Acts 4:20. — Then, how is the wisdom of serpents to be our guide? The Lord tells us v. 23a. We should not needlessly expose ourselves in times of persecution, much less court danger. When really violent persecutions are in evidence, we may escape from danger if it can be done without denial of the truth, and seek safety and a place for bearing witness elsewhere. Thus Christ Himself, Mark 3:6, 7. The disciples, Acts 12:19b; 9:23-25; 2 Cor. 11:33. The first Christians, Acts 8:1-4. If thrown into the company of men and women who delight in reviling our Lord and all that is sacred, then remember Matt. 7:6 and depart.

V. 16. "Harmless as doves," without admixture of evil, free from guile, innocent. Disciples of Christ should so conduct themselves, especially in times of opposition and persecution, as not to give just cause for accusation, 1 Pet. 4:15; Matt. 5:11. Besides, they should not return like for like, 1 Pet. 3:9, 15, 16; Matt. 5:44-47, yet not enter into compromise with error. The Savior is our best example. Observe Him in dealing with His enemies, especially from Gethsemane to Calvary. Also 1 Pet. 2:23. Such an attitude may not avert suffering, but it gives the satisfaction that we are following Christ's directions. And the Lord does not leave us without comfort.

3

V. 18. "For My sake." Suffering for His sake is the Christian's badge of honor. The disciple must not expect a better lot than was his Master's, vv. 24, 25, 38. What an honor to be permitted to share it with Him! Acts 5:41; Matt. 5:11, 12. John the Baptist, Mark 6:27. Stephen, Acts 7:58.

V. 16. "I send you." That assures the disciples of His assistance and protection, vv. 29, 30. Oppressors, tormentors, and persecutors will not be able to go beyond what He permits, Ps. 91. Even if disciples should lose their lives for confessing Christ, they should rest assured that their Lord will confess them before His Father, vv. 32, 39b. What an honor; what a comfort!

Vv. 19, 20. The Lord is not forbidding His disciples to do any thinking about what they might say. He is rather comforting them. He does not want them to worry; it shall be given them how and what they shall speak. This is a very special promise to the dis-

ciples. They were to speak by divine inspiration also before councils, governors, and kings in times of persecution. What a comfort! The Lord does not forbid us to think about answers to be made to gainsayers. It might be the height of folly not to give some thought to them. Such thinking must, however, be done with prayer for guidance, Ps. 51:15. But prepared speeches may not fit the occasion or make the desired impression. Besides, there may be no time for reflection and preparation. In no case, however, should we worry; for the Lord will stand by us, so that we shall profess a good profession, 1 Tim. 6:12, in times of peril. Some of the finest and most impressive replies to opponents were unprepared. Cf. Dan. 3:16-18; Luther at Worms. Simple devout Christians have by the grace and guidance of God given replies that have discomfited the enemies. What a comfort to know that in the dark days that may lie before us we shall never be forsaken, but that the Holy Spirit within us will guide our hearts and lips for the proper defense!

Let us pray the Lord to avert in His mercy all opposition and persecution, especially to grant us faithfulness to the end in times of peace and peril, v. 22b.

R. NETTZEL

Fourth Sunday after Easter

Matt. 10:24-33

The Great Commission was not given to apostles alone but to all Christians. The early Christians took this commission seriously and were active in personal evangelism. (Cf. Acts 11:20; 1 Thess. 1:8; Eph. 6:15.) The church historian Latourette tells us that the chief agents in the expansion of Christianity were not the regularly called pastors, but the men and women who spoke of their Christian faith as occasion presented itself. The testimony for Christ will always arouse bitter opposition. Our text speaks of the dangers which the Twelve would face in their first mission journey through the land of Palestine, of the opposition which they would encounter prior to the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the lot of all faithful witnesses until the end of time. Our text is an encouragement for personal evangelism. We need such encouragement. Are we as a Synod, as a congregation, as individuals, following the example of early Christians? How many adults have been gained? Why not more? Does the opposition to our testimony silence us?

Gaining Courage for Personal Evangelism

1

You must learn to spurn the ridicule of the world. a) The Pharisees called Christ Beelzebub. Etymology of the word not established, probably, master of a temple with idolatrous sacrifices.

We must be prepared for the world's ridicule and slander. Slandorous charges against early Christians. Marxian Socialism: Religion is the opiate of the people. Churches and capitalism an unholy alliance to destroy the masses. Church has blocked scientific progress, interfered with attainment of social security. Modern Pharisees and Sadducees deny the deity, some even the historicity, of Christ and ridicule the followers of Christ as people who are out of step with the tempo of our modern enlightened age. b) Such slander is really our badge of honor. True, our Old Adam cannot endure the ridicule. He wants to be progressive, modern, enlightened. The Christian's highest honor in v. 25. Be courageous — not fanatical — in confessing Christ by word and deed. Spurn the resultant ridicule.

2

You dare never forget the earnest command. a) The preaching of the Gospel seems to be more popular today than in previous decades. Is there a religious revival? The Bible is the "best seller." Circulation of religious books has increased. Religious programs on the radio are heard every day. Former modernistic theologians are no longer so violent in their opposition to the Gospel. The natural man, however, does not love the Gospel of the Crucified, even though he may extol the Bible. His doctrine is work-righteousness. And he loves this naturalistic theology, defends it, clings to it, resents any interference. He opposes the Gospel. Shall we be silent? The Old Adam suggests it. Many Christians travel incognito from their homes to their places of business day after day. They seem to have read only the subordinate clauses in v. 27. When have you spoken to some one about the hopelessness of human systems of salvation and of the glories of the Christian religion? Lack of courage? b) Study the command in our text. You have learned the Law and the Gospel in school, in instruction, in Bible class, in the regular sermons. Preach it from the housetops. Both Law (cf. today's Gospel-lesson) and the Gospel. — The command will give us courage. Without a direct commission no one is willing to undertake an important task. With a direct command the most timid soul gains courage.

3

You must learn the only correct world-view. What keeps us from testifying? Fear that we might lose our position, our money, our friends, our life. (Yes, martyrdom is possible in the twentieth century. Consider the prophecies!) These tangible things seem very important, yes, essential. If choice is between them and the Gospel, what shall we choose? The Savior uses the extreme case of losing our life to show us the proper evaluation of all temporal

things. b) The most important thing in life is to keep a clear conscience by obeying God's will. No compromise is possible. Joseph. Trust in the providence of God. If you really and fully believe Christ's promise, then you will have the courage to confess your Savior before men.

4

You must constantly keep the Judgment in mind. Confess and deny not. Disregard your convenience. Seek glory of your Savior by word and deed. (Cf. *Luth. Wit.*, LX, 86.) Acts 4:20; Luke 9:26; 2 Tim. 2:12. Whenever tempted to deny, i. e., to keep silent when opportunity to confess is offered, think of the final Judgment. A denial now may mean loss of faith, and continued denial may mean eternal rejection. Every confession is evidence of your faith. He that believes and confesses here: Christ is my Savior, shall hear Christ say: Father, this is My brother.

NOTE.—This sermon may be presented in a negative form. Why Do We So Often Lack the Courage for Personal Evangelism? We fear the ridicule of the world; we forget Christ's command; we lack the correct world-view; we forget the Judgment of the Last Day.

F. E. MAYER

Fifth Sunday after Easter

Luke 11:9-13

The world is prone to minimize the wonderful Christian privilege of prayer. The world with its philosophy of materialism, with its spirit of fatalism, and its rampant unbelief is apt to call prayer "mere wishful thinking" or "an escape mechanism." The unbelieving world, without faith in God, does not hesitate to say that he who prays merely talks to himself and not to God. They do not hesitate to call the Christian on his knees a praying fool.

The world's attitude towards prayer is not the attitude of the Bible. The Word of God emphasizes prayer in many different ways. The Bible speaks of the various types of prayer, Ps. 19:14. It tells us of the reasons for praying, Ps. 50:15. It directs us to the proper object of prayer, Matt. 4:10; Ps. 65:2. It gives us the scope of prayer, Phil. 4:6; Mark 11:24; 1 Tim. 2:1. It tells us that all prayers are to come before the throne of God in the name of Jesus, John 16:23.

Our text for the Fifth Sunday after Easter (Rogate) speaks of prayer. It emphasizes, in the words of the Savior, the intensity of Christian prayer. It gives wonderful prayer promises and shows that the Lord is ready to give to His praying children even the greatest of all gifts, the gift of His Holy Spirit. On the basis

of this text, permit me to speak to you this morning on the subject

Precious Prayer Promises

1. *The threefold promise to hear God-pleasing prayers*
2. *The definite promise to give particularly spiritual gifts*

I

a) In order to be able to understand our text, it is well to study the context. Our text chapter opens with the request of one of the disciples, "Lord, teach us to pray as John also taught his disciples," Luke 11:1. In answer to this request the Savior had given His disciples the glorious words of the Lord's Prayer. He had followed His instruction on prayer with an illustration showing the need of persistence in prayer, Luke 11:5-8. He had ended this story by saying: "Yet, because of his importunity, he will rise and give him as many as he needeth"; and then followed the words of our text.

b) Our text contains Christ's wonderful counsel to pray. He says: Text, v. 9: "And I say unto you." He makes to His own disciples this most positive and assured declaration, v. 9 b. Three imperatives urge prayer upon us, "Ask, seek, knock." Today, tomorrow, every time, you have need; you cannot come too often. The counsel of the Savior is counsel for extended, prolonged, prayer action. He warns against mere repetition and much speaking, Matt. 6:7, but urges prayer very, very definitely by repeating the imperatives. He does not wish to indicate that, if we ask and do not receive, we should then seek. Nor does He mean that, if we have sought God in prayer and have not found Him, we then should begin to knock. In spite of the fact that the three terms seem to indicate an increasing intensity of prayer, the Savior merely heaps expressions to show the importance of continuing in prayer.

c) Christ's triple counsel to pray is followed by a threefold promise to hear. Yes, this threefold prayer promise is really duplicated, so that it becomes a double promise, vv. 9, 10. The promises seem to be given in reverse order to the counsel to pray. "It shall be given you" seems to be the strongest promise. But again, as in the counsel to pray, the Savior really means the same thing in every promise. Note that all three promises are categorical without an "if" or "but." God always hears believing prayer, and this is what the Savior wishes to emphasize. A little boy had prayed for a bicycle for Christmas. His poor mother could not supply this gift. She said to the boy, "Are you disappointed that God did not hear your prayer?" The little boy said, "God heard,

but His answer was 'No.' Yes, God's answer to prayer is "No" at times, but usually it is "Not now" or "Yes."

d) Do we need the Savior's counsel to pray and His precious promises to hear? We only have to investigate our own prayer-life. Our prayers are often neglected, they are often languid, they often mean so little to us. Yes, frequently, the hammer of God's affliction has to strike us down before we are ready to look up, before we are ready to pray. But in the hour of need, in the hour of trouble, when everything else goes wrong, when our best friends forsake us, when the world seems to be toppling down upon us, what a wonderful thing to have ringing in our ears the precious prayer promise of the Savior, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find," etc., or Ps. 50:15!

2

a) The second part of our text shows us what the greatest of gifts really is which the believing soul can receive in answer to prayer. Even Christian people often forget what this gift is. The sick Christian who prays often thinks that health is the greatest gift. The Christian in poverty often thinks that wealth and plenty are the greatest gift. The Christian who is hungry may think that food is the most wonderful gift, the most wonderful blessing God can bestow in answer to prayer. But our text indicates that these blessings, great as they may appear in the moment of stress, are not the greatest blessing God can bestow in answer to prayer.

b) Our text, v. 13, indicates that the greatest gift our heavenly Father can give, is the gift of His Holy Spirit. This gift to the Christian means an increase in faith, means greater assurance of the fact of forgiveness through the atonement of Christ. The gift of the Spirit means a deepening of spiritual knowledge, a better grasp upon things divine, a more lively and more buoyant hope of heaven, John 14:26; 15:26. The gift of the Holy Spirit to the praying Christian means growth in sanctification and holiness, more readiness to serve God and our fellow-men. The gift of the Holy Spirit is indeed the greatest gift the praying Christian can receive.

c) Do we always recognize the greatness of this gift? Do we frequently pray just for this gift? How often have you during the past month really asked God to be a better Christian? How often have you prayed for an increase in faith? How often have you pleaded with God for growth in sanctification? 2 Pet. 3:18. We often pray for temporal, material, blessings, but how often for the gift of the Holy Spirit? We need just such instruction, such encouragement, as the Savior here gives, to pray more earnestly for this gift of the Holy Spirit.

d) In order to emphasize the readiness of God to hear our prayer, particularly prayers for spiritual gifts, the Savior in vv. 11 and 12 refers to the fact that even a sinful human father will not give his children evil gifts. No ordinary father will give a son who asks for bread for his breakfast a cold hard stone. No ordinary father will give to a son who asks for a fish for his dinner a slimy serpent instead. No ordinary father who has the welfare of his child at heart will give him a poisonous scorpion when he pleads for an egg for supper. Following up these examples, the Savior says: v. 13.

The Savior's words are plain and simple. They contain most precious prayer promises. They give us the necessary instruction, so that none of us dare say, "We did not know the goodness of our God. We did not know His willingness to hear." How often does it not happen that we have not because we asked not! Jas. 4:2. Our faith is often so small that we simply do not storm the citadel of heaven with our prayers. May this Rogate Sunday, the prayer Sunday of the church-year, encourage us anew to be constant in our prayer, to lay hold upon the glorious promises of our God, and through our prayers tap the dynamo of heaven for spiritual strength, for courage in the day of trouble, and especially for the wondrous gift of God's Holy Spirit! Hymn 247:1.

E. L. ROSCHKE

Ascension Day

Luke 24:49-53

Ascension Day is being celebrated less than formerly. The celebration of a special day is not commanded, nor is it essential. But must we not fear that, at least in a measure, this decline is the result of a lack of appreciation of the event itself?

The Scriptures attach great importance to the Lord's ascension. It was predicted in the Old Testament, Ps. 68. Christ repeatedly refers to it as marking His return to the Father, John 6:62; 7:33. We have three accounts of the event in the gospels and many references to it in the epistles.

Our text briefly tells the story. Luke here mentions one feature not contained in other accounts. Twice in the few verses he calls attention to the fact that Jesus blessed His disciples. We may profitably direct our attention today to this statement of the evangelist and shall see that it sums up the meaning of the ascension of our Lord. Applying the statement of the Lord in Gen. 12:2 to our Savior, we shall meditate on this topic:

The Ascended Lord Blessing His Own

He says:

1. *I will bless thee*
2. *Thou shalt be a blessing*

1

Since that Thursday on which the ascension of Jesus occurred, His visible presence has been no longer enjoyed by His believers on the earth. But this separation did not fill the disciples with sadness; rather: v. 52b. For the Lord was parted from them while He blessed them. "Thus the disciples were to remember their dear Lord and Master; thus we are to picture our Savior to ourselves as a Savior who in heaven is lifting up His hands and blessing His own." (*Stoeckhardt.*)

To bless, when used of God, means "to bestow divine favor and confer divine benefits." (*Davis.*) The Scriptures mention this bestowing of gifts upon us as the purpose of Christ's ascension, Ps. 68:18; Eph. 4:8. Sitting at the right hand of God, He is in a position to bless us, Matt. 28:18; Eph. 1:20 ff.

His gifts are truly divine benefits, of inestimable value to every Christian. The most important and most necessary gift, the promise of the Father, v. 49, or the Holy Spirit, John 16:7, shall be studied more closely at Pentecost. But our bountiful Head of the Church also blesses His own with other gifts. Paul mentions such gifts in Eph. 4:11 ff. To refer to only one blessing we are enjoying as a result of the gift of the apostles to the Church, thank God for the New Testament, the final revelation of God before Judgment Day. Who can properly evaluate the faithful pastors and teachers whom the Lord gives to His people? Try to estimate their importance for eternity in the light of the apostle's words Eph. 4:12 ff.

Another gift that should fill our hearts with gratitude is the assurance of His intercession, Rom. 8:34; 1 John 2:1 f. Our uncounted sins would drive us to despair without this Advocate; but now we are sure that we shall not lose the favor of God but remain His dear children, Rom. 8:31 ff.

After a short pilgrimage on earth we pass into eternity; but we may do so without fear, for He is preparing the last and lasting gift, John 14:2.

The hosts of heaven rejoiced at the return of the conquering Hero; how joyfully we should join in the praise of our ascended Lord, ascending with the gifts to bestow upon us!

2

The ascended Lord is now blessing His own also from this point of view, that He is now making a blessing of us.

How empty a life that is of no value to others! Pagan Titus realized this and considered a day lost on which he had not done a favor to somebody. But the Lord has privileged us to be the bearers of a blessing of inestimable value.

On their return to Jerusalem the disciples were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God. This they did not only

as a private devotion, but, as Mark points out, they preached everywhere, Mark 16:20. In order that they might be able to become a blessing, the Lord promises them that they shall be endued with power from on high, v. 49. As long as the Lord was visibly present on the earth, it was He primarily who was to seek and to save that which was lost. Now His disciples were to bring this message of salvation to a world full of despair. And what a blessing these first disciples proved to be! Heaven alone will reveal the extent of this blessing.

But the ascended Lord has the same message to you and me and all believers of our time: "Thou shalt be a blessing." 1 Pet. 2:9 commissions every one of us as witnesses of Christ to bring salvation to a sin-cursed mankind. Now we indeed have something to live for, a glorious objective for our life, to save sinners.

To be sure, of ourselves we are neither worthy nor able to accomplish this great task. But we, too, are endued with power from on high by the Lord of the Church, and in His strength we may cheerfully go out to save sinners.

Are you such a blessing? May the Lord fill us with increased zeal and devotion!

PAUL F. KOEHNEKE

Sixth Sunday after Easter

John 7:33-39

The text takes us to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Tabernacles. In memory of God's loving care on the long journey of Israel in the wilderness, particularly of the waters of Meribah, Ex. 17, the priests drew water from the Pool of Siloam and poured it into a basin near the altar, while priests, choir, and people recited Is. 12:3 and Ps. 118. Christ took His topic for this sermon from that ceremony. St. Paul refers to this 1 Cor. 10:4 and says, "That Rock was Christ." Jesus Himself says to the woman at Jacob's Well: John 4:10. — Nothing is more terrible than thirst; nothing more essential for our physical life than water. Even more essential for us is the Water of Life, which can quench the thirst of our soul and preserve our life for eternity. How precious, then, the invitation of Christ in v. 37! — Let us note what the Lord says of

The True Water of Life

1. Christ alone offers it
2. The thirsty receive it
3. They dispense it to others

1

The dread wilderness through which Israel traveled is a fair picture of this world; it has no springs of salvation, nor can we dig any wells. Christ is the only Source of salvation; not His moral teaching, though John 7:46; not His example, though John 8:46;

18:38; 1 Pet. 2:22; but Christ, the Rock that was smitten, Is. 53:5, by Moses, the Law, Gal. 3:13; Christ, crucified by man but by the counsel of God, Acts 2:23; 4:27, 28; John 3:16. Now He is the fountain of salvation, 1 Pet. 1:18, 19; 1 John 1:7; Rev. 5:9. He alone, John 6:53.

2

All the Israelites drank of the Rock. All the world is invited to come and drink of this Rock; they all need it. One should expect that all would come running. Not so; only the thirsty will come, those who feel this need; those whom the Law has made hungry and thirsty after righteousness; who have learned that this world has only broken cisterns, that can hold no water, Jer. 2:13; whose souls are perishing with thirst after God and His peace, Ps. 42:2; 63:2.

To such Jesus promises the satisfying Water of Life, v. 37; Is. 44:3; 55:1; Ps. 23:2; 94:19. By His Spirit, v. 39, in His Word He offers them a never-failing fountain of comfort and strength as they travel under the hot sun over the burning sand of the desert world. And they who follow His invitation will find that He speaks the truth, John 4:14; 6:35. From this fountain flows peace of conscience, a sure defense against the Law's accusation, strength in temptation, comfort in affliction, and a calm trust in God when the world hates and doubts assail the heart.

What of the others? Christ invites them, too; but since they reject Him, they remain thirsty. More, Jesus issues a solemn warning, vv. 33, 34. Those who say, "I will not," too long, will finally say, "I cannot," because God says, "You shall not," Prov. 1:24-32; Amos 8:11-13. A few years later that became a bitter fact for the Jews. Luther's warning to Germany (St. L. Ed., VIII: 70 ff.) came true: Counter-Reformation, Thirty Years' War, Rationalism.

3

V. 38 (R. V.: "from within him"). To Abraham God said: Gen. 12:2. So ever; that is God's plan; Christ states it as a simple fact that will always happen as a matter of course; it is the very nature of faith, 2 Cor. 4:13. So the early Church, Acts 2; 5:28; 8:4; 1 Thess. 1:8. So the Church in all these centuries. After Luther had found the Water of Life in Scripture, he brought it to his students, to his congregation, to the world. Our fathers, a hundred years ago, at once set out on vast missionary projects. Our own church in this locality, etc.

What would have become of us if others had not brought us the Water of Life? Perished with thirst! Bring it to others, fathers, mothers, teachers in school and Sunday-school, Christians all, by greater missionary zeal.

2 Cor. 6:2.

THEO. HOYER

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

"When Is a Lutheran a 'Good Lutheran'?" — With this question the *Lutheran Church Quarterly* (April, 1940) concerns itself in a somewhat lengthy article, which, however, in the end leaves the question unanswered. Beginning with a passage in modernizing Paul Tillich's autobiographical sketch (in his book *The Interpretation of History*) in which occurs the statement "The substance of my religion is and remains Lutheran," then pointing out that modernistic Reinhold Niebuhr (Union Theological Seminary) has been described, in an article on "The Amsterdam Conference," appearing in a British periodical, as "the famous American Lutheran professor," which term he did not resent, though "he apparently gave different content to the term than is common in Lutheran circles," and next suggesting how different are the concepts of "good Lutheranism" among Lutherans of General Synod and Augustana background or of Hauge Synod and Missouri Synod background, he shows that the question "What is a good Lutheran?" is at least intelligible, if not justified. Summing up his conclusions, he states that a man may be considered more or less a "good Lutheran" as he falls within one or more of the following classes of Lutherans: "(1) He may be a Lutheran by rearing and education, in which case his world-view may be profoundly influenced by his Lutheran training even though he is only vaguely aware of this influence. (2) He may be a Lutheran as a practicing churchman. (3) He may be a Lutheran as a theoretical churchman in that his faith is in agreement with the symbolic formulations. (4) He may be a Lutheran as a disciple of Dr. Martin Luther." "Most of us," he then explains, "who consider ourselves Lutheran are a confused mixture of all four classes," and he thinks that "there are some who could be rated 'good Lutherans' under Classes 1, 2, and 3 of our classification who would have to be considered 'poor Lutherans' in Class 4." The latter remark he expounds thus: "Those theologians, for example, who have their roots in seventeenth-century Lutheran scholasticism rather than in the Reformation era have more in common with the Aristotelian views of Calovius and Gerhard than with the nominalism of Luther. On the critical questions of the doctrine of the Word of God and of the Church they find their support in seventeenth-century Lutheranism rather than in Luther. On the other hand, much of the strength of Lutheranism which still remains in Germany rests in men such as the followers of Karl Holl, who are 'good Lutherans' in Class 4 but very indifferent Lutherans judging by the norms of Classes 2 and 3."

Since, then, great difficulties arise when one attempts to set up norms for delimiting the class of "good Lutherans," the writer suggests the following principles to guide those who wish to perform this arduous task: (1) "The adoption of any one standard for the use of the term 'Lutheran' is an arbitrary judgment and should be recognized and admitted as such by those who adopt that standard. (2) On the adoption of any one standard the term 'good Lutheran' is not automatically

defined but presupposes a sliding scale of comparatively 'good Lutherans,' according as the standard is intended to measure (a) theological tendency, (b) congregational loyalty, (c) fidelity to the Confessions, (d) synodical regularity. (3) In using the term 'good Lutheran' to designate a fellow-Lutheran, it is necessary to state specifically which norm (or norms) is used and to what extent a person is more or less a 'good Lutheran' on the sliding scales within at least four different classes of Lutherans. (4) The synodical body that fixes standards for determining 'good Lutheranism' is at liberty to take the steps in that direction that are regarded as expedient. But the standard should not be made to operate so as to deprive others not affiliated with the body of the right to be called 'good Lutherans.'"

It is very interesting to note that the writer blames Luther himself for the difficulty in grouping the different kinds of Lutherans. He says: "The roots of this difficulty for Lutherans probably rest in Luther's own views, for in emphasizing the importance of the Church as the congregation of true believers, he broke the authority of all institutional norms. In placing the individual as alone responsible over against a God of justice and love, he relegated all corporate ecclesiastical organization to a role of secondary importance. The Christian thus finds himself in the paradoxical position where he can never separate himself from the Church and yet must never allow himself to become dependent upon the institutionalized Church for his salvation. The problem of living in the midst of this paradox and the task of reconciling this paradoxical situation in his society place a strenuous responsibility upon the shoulders of the Lutheran churchman at all times and places."

But really, does it? To us it seems that the difficulty is not so very great after all. For one thing, the question in the final analysis is not: "What is a *good* Lutheran?" but: "What is a Lutheran?" Lutheranism represents a definite faith, or profession. To be a Lutheran means to hold the principles which Luther held, or to believe and live those spiritual truths which Luther believed and lived. In particular, it means to believe and live the Bible as Luther believed and lived it. Luther regarded the canonical Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament as so absolutely inspired that "one single word made the world too narrow for him," that is, that one single word demanded his complete consecration and obedience. Accordingly, Luther believed that the whole Bible should be taught, and nothing but the Bible; no human speculation but God's Word only. Again, Luther believed that the teachings of the Bible must be lived; in other words, in his religious scheme of things, sanctification follows upon justification, and Christian sanctification embraces the frank confession of truth in the face of error, just as also strict separation from all who teach false doctrine. Matters of doctrine were to Luther supremely important matters. He was neither a liberalist nor a unionist, but an honest, outspoken follower and defender of the Bible.

Now, then, judged by the standards of Luther's faith and profession, modernizing Paul Tillich is not a Lutheran, for he subscribes neither to Scripture nor to the Lutheran Confessions in the sense of Luther. Nor is modernistic Niebuhr a Lutheran, nor Karl Barth, nor any one

who wilfully departs from Scripture in faith and practice. The claim that there is a chasm between "seventeenth-century Lutheran scholasticism" and "Lutheran nominalism" is a myth. On the questions of the Word of God and the Church these Lutheran dogmaticians only restated what Luther had written before them on these doctrines. Calov and Gerhard did not go one iota beyond Luther in teaching and defending the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola fide*. Nor can we see how the "roots of difficulty for Lutherans rest in Luther's own views," for while it is true that Luther regarded the Church, in its proper sense, as the *congregatio credentium*, or the *communio sanctorum*, just because of that fact he warned all Christians against all false teachers and called upon them to separate their connection with erring church-bodies. We write this, not in a spirit of carping criticism but in that of brotherly helpfulness, seeking that desirable church union which is anchored in true unity of faith, but which, alas, seems still so far away. Lutheranism has a definite historical meaning, and to be a Lutheran, in the true historical sense, means to measure up to the high standards of faith and practice that are rooted in God's infallible Word. As we measure up to the standards of God's Word, we shall be genuine Lutherans and shall then also attain to the desirable goal of a truly united American Lutheranism. In the last analysis the question is merely: "Are we going to accept the Word of God, or are we going to reject it?" Just that decides whether we are Lutherans or not.

J. T. M.

Agreement in Doctrine as a Prerequisite for Church-Fellowship.—The editor of the *Lutheran Standard*, the Rev. E. W. Schramm, taking as his caption the words "A Real Fallacy," criticizes a statement made by Dr. Behnken at the meeting in Columbus, O., at which the case of orphaned Lutheran missions was discussed. He writes: "To think that cooperation among Lutherans in matters of common responsibility has something to do with fostering unity is not a fallacy. That was the burden of an editorial in last week's issue. To think that agreement in doctrine is the *sole* requirement of real unity is a fallacy. That is the burden of this editorial. Here, in the words of President Behnken of the Missouri Synod, is a clear statement of the view that complete agreement in doctrine is all that is necessary to complete unity: 'We believe that you must touch the very heart and core of the matter and reach agreement in doctrine. The Lord says, "Endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . . . One Lord, one faith, one Baptism," etc. If such real unity is achieved on the basis of God's Word, then all other matters will readily be solved, then cooperation in other matters will become self-evident.' Although there is much truth in this statement, it contains a very serious fallacy, one that has been a prime obstacle in the way of effecting full-orbed unity among Lutherans in America. For when we analyze this statement in the light of the attempts that have been made to 'reach agreement in doctrine,' we discover that the emphasis is entirely too much on intellectual agreement and entirely too little on the requisites of unity which the inspired Paul enumerates in the opening verses of the second chapter of his Letter to the Philippians—'Be of the same mind, having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind; doing nothing through faction or vainglory,

but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself. . . . Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus.' In other words, the emphasis is too exclusively on theology and too little on Christian attitude and Christian life. And the fallacy consists in the claim that agreement in theology—and that alone—effects full unity and lays the basis for full Christian fellowship in worship and work, and that spiritual affinity, oneness in heart and soul and love, oneness in the attitude and mind of Christ, oneness in joint labors with Christ and for Christ, are all to be regarded as not even remotely connected with the fostering of Christian unity. That is a fallacy of the deepest dye."

To bring out fully what Editor Schramm has in mind, we ought to quote some more sentences from his article: "The simple fact of the matter is that full, Spirit-wrought, fruitful Christian unity demands oneness in Christlikeness and in the Christ-life just as truly as it demands oneness in the doctrine of Christ. And it is a fact of Christian experience that we may sense a closer tie of Christian unity with some one who disagrees with us on some points of doctrine than with some one else who, ostensibly at least, fully agrees with us in doctrine. The explanation, of course, is not hard to find. 'The heart has reasons which the reason cannot know.' Joint agreement on a set of doctrinal theses does not of necessity make two Christians 'of one accord.' The word in Phil. 2:2 that is translated 'being of one accord' is *sumpsuchoi* and might be translated 'soul-buddies,' or, as Dean Farrar has rendered it, 'heart-united.' So-called doctrinal agreement does not necessarily make us heart-united. If a Lutheran pastor fails to extend the common social amenities to a younger Lutheran pastor of another synod who calls upon him to consult with him in a friendly way about the status of a person who is nominally a member of the latter pastor's congregation, the doctrine of this latter pastor may be never so orthodox, but the younger Lutheran pastor is probably going to discover closer spiritual affinity between himself and some courteous, Christlike Salvation Army captain than between himself and this inconsiderate pastor of a Lutheran synod that is commendably conservative."

Asserting a greater inclination of the laity to bring about the union of Lutheran bodies, while he acknowledges that there may be "failure on the part of the laity to some extent to realize the importance of some of the points in doctrine and in church practice that are at issue," Editor Schramm holds that the laymen see clearly "that there are more things in heaven and earth than settling theological differences; that a more united Lutheranism would mean a more effective agency for Christ and against Satan; . . . that, if Christians are really united in Christ, then they have enough of the truth to insure unity; and that, if they are not united in Christ, they have no real unity, no matter how much alleged doctrinal agreement may exist." That the establishment of union in the foreign field and in the work of inner missions at home usually is more easily achieved than at the home base itself, he holds is due to this, that in these difficult situations spiritual realities and responsibilities and privileges are more clearly seen "because we see things with our hearts as well as with our heads." He emphasizes that "the Gospel of Jesus

Christ must affect not only our intellects but also our hearts. To imagine that, if a group of theologians can come to intellectual agreement on a set of theological theses, their constituencies are forthwith in perfect Christian unity, is sheer nonsense." Viewing the matter in what he terms a practical way, he says: "Has not the progress thus far made in the attainment of more ideal Lutheran unity been largely the result of the bearing of one another's burdens through such agencies as the National Lutheran Council and the Lutheran World Convention?" And he closes the editorial with these words: "To deny the contribution of the cultivation of such a family spirit, of such cooperation in common tasks, to the cause of Lutheran unity, is one of the most subtle and dangerous fallacies that is plaguing the road to Lutheran unity in our day."

There are a number of matters here which invite discussion; we shall confine ourselves to what we consider most important.

Certainly Editor Schramm is right when he says: "To imagine that, if a group of theologians can come to intellectual agreement on a set of theological theses, their constituencies are forthwith in perfect Christian unity, is sheer nonsense." Yea and amen. We hope that none of the Lutheran bodies involved will ever commit the fatal error of letting committees draw up articles of agreement and sign them in the name of their Church without themselves carefully examining these articles and ascertaining whether they received the sincere endorsement of the rank and file. A mere paper unity, or a unity dictated from above, is something all Christians must abominate. We hope that the editor of the *Lutheran Standard* does not think that we favor the establishment of fellowship on such a basis. When he furthermore says that to be united must mean oneness in Christlikeness and in the Christ-life, we again fully agree with him. Not merely the heads but the hearts must be united, and the common bond must be joint doctrinal convictions, and especially faith in Christ and love of God and the neighbor. Again we say, We hope that the editor does not think that we of the Missouri Synod are so indifferent toward plain teachings of Scripture as to ignore or even deny that a common dedication to a Christlike life must be a prerequisite of fellowship. If he understands Dr. Behnken to mean that all that is necessary for fellowship among Lutherans is an *intellectual* agreement on doctrinal propositions, he is in error.

Everybody who has studied the history of the Missouri Synod knows that here we are treating of a vital point in Missouri's position. In endeavoring to do its work and to help in rallying Lutherans around the banner of our great Confessions, the Missouri Synod has insisted on unity in doctrine as a condition of fellowship. The unity of doctrine which it has sponsored and proclaimed as essential it has not conceived of as being merely a matter of the intellect but as a joint whole-hearted, joyful acceptance of everything the Scriptures teach, a joint acceptance born of the grateful conviction that God's Word is truth. It would have seemed utterly wrong to our fathers (and does to us today) to think of our acceptance of the great things that God has taught us with respect to our faith and life as a mere intellectual process. But this view our fathers did hold, and we hold it with them, that in an alliance where

there is whole-hearted, sincere acceptance of everything the Scriptures teach, in other words, where there is an *ex-animo* unity of doctrine, questions pertaining to life, matters of church practice, will be easily adjusted. Let two men be fully and gratefully agreed in everything that Christ taught, and the question whether it is right, let us say, to belong to the Knights of Pythias will not for a long time be a matter of controversy with them. Even if they do not at once agree in their judgment on membership in that particular lodge, they will soon be of one mind on that practical question. But if there is not whole-hearted acceptance of what Christ teaches in both camps which are negotiating with each other, the result, if they form a union, will not only be that the one party tramples under foot what the other considers divine truth, but the foundation for reaching that Christlike unity in life and conduct will likewise be lacking. How can there be true unity in Christian endeavors without mutually accepted principles of faith and conduct?

The subject has too many ramifications to permit of our doing justice to it in a few brief remarks. We mainly wish to assert here that the position which Dr. Behnken voiced in Columbus not only is the historical one of the Missouri Synod but likewise in our conviction rests on a solid Scriptural basis.

A.

Omaha Once More.—An open letter in the *Lutheran* of March 5, 1941, prepared, as the editor informs the readers, by the Rev. Dr. Charles Leslie Venable of Chicago, contains important statements on the action taken by the Omaha convention of the U. L. C. A. last October with respect to the Pittsburgh Agreement.

The correspondent avers: "The action of the Omaha convention was taken on the solemn assurance of the president of the United Lutheran Church that the Agreement did not mean a verbally errorless Bible, that it did not mean that a man could not be a good member of the United Lutheran Church and a good member of the Masonic fraternity* and that it did not mean any change in positions or practices already adopted in the U. L. C. A., 'principles to which we have been winning the other Lutherans in America.'†

"I call upon every delegate to bear me witness that the action of the convention was taken on the basis of these three solemn assurances. It was these assurances which changed a convention in which proponents could not be found to speak on the Agreement on Friday afternoon into a convention which gave it a majority vote Saturday morning. The majority vote was not for any change but on the assurance that no change was involved; it was not on any issue but on the assurance that there was no issue being raised. Plainly, the bulk of those who voted for the measure did so because they felt that, if it involved no change, furthered Lutheran union, as was so desperately desired by so sincere

* On direct question of Mr. E. F. Konering of St. Louis, Mo.

† "Quoted from the transcript of Dr. Knubel's address on the question at the convention. The assurance is given with regard to 'organizations' on page 3 in these words: 'We have been winning the representatives of the A. L. C. to stand with us'; and on page 5 with reference to the Scripture as quoted above. The transcript even records the applause of the convention when this was announced as the significance of the Agreement."

a person and one who had given so much to Lutheran unity as our president, it would be both insult and injury to him and to Lutheran union not to grant it. Of this the Church should be fully advised."

Dr. Venable claims that the minority in the convention which opposed acceptance of the Pittsburgh Agreement included every theological professor except one who spoke on the question. "They held that, if the Agreement did not mean Bible literalism and lodge legalism, it would be made to mean these things in certain Lutheran quarters in America."

On the question whether these fears were justified Dr. Venable says: "That these fears were not groundless has been shown by subsequent events. According to our information the American Lutheran Church postponed action on the Agreement for two years to see whether the adoption of these statements will make any difference in our practice. Apparently, what meant 'no change' to us did not mean 'no change' to them; what meant the winning through of our principles to us meant the winning through of their principles to them; and the articles of agreement are articles of disagreement even before they are adopted."

Were the delegates of Omaha aware of the significance of the Pittsburgh Agreement? The correspondent of the *Lutheran* makes the assertion: "There was one thing on which both the majority and the minority were agreed: they both were certain that they were not voting for any changes in the positions or practices of the U. L. C. A."

The conclusion reached in the letter is: "In common decency and honesty the United Lutheran Church ought to say bluntly what she said deviously but distinctly at Omaha: We will not accept Bible literalism nor lodge legalism. We ought forever to be done with trying to hunt with the hounds of sectarianism and to run with the hares of ecumenicity. When we make Christ central and judge all Scripture, as all other things, by Him, we get unity and ecumenicity. When we start with Bible literalism, we land in sectarianism and quarreling over all kinds of myopic matters like lodges. One of these Bible literalistic groups has as its divisive doctrine, so derived, that not buttons but only hooks are to be allowed on clothes."

If these words correctly describe the events at Omaha and the situation in the U. L. C. A., every one who loves conservative Lutheranism must feel profoundly sorry. It is evident that on the important doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible the house of the U. L. C. A. is divided and that those rejecting verbal inspiration are granted the same rights and privileges which those who adhere to that doctrine possess. On one point Dr. Venable seems to be in error. Previous reports on the Omaha convention stated it was due to a mutual arrangement that on Friday afternoon the opponents of the Pittsburgh Agreement spoke, while Saturday morning was set aside for the addresses of the defenders. But what of the remarks made by President Knubel and appealed to by the correspondent? The editor of the *Lutheran* discusses some (not all) points raised by Dr. Venable, among them the alleged statements of the president. He first correctly declares that what the presiding officer says at a convention in reply to an inquiry does "not rate with the action by the convention itself on the questions at issue, unless there lies in the answer

a misleading or erroneous response." He admits that President Knubel stated when asked what effect adoption of the Pittsburgh Agreement would have upon a lodge-member: "There would be no effect in this instance." The editor of the *Lutheran* explains this remark by saying that the U. L. C. A. Washington Declaration of 1920 had pronounced against membership in societies "injurious to the Christian faith" and that hence the lodge paragraph of the Pittsburgh Agreement did not advocate anything new. Given an opportunity to testify, Dr. Knubel should have positively stated that the lodge paragraph under discussion was intended to brand lodge-membership as sinful and should have called on all members of his church-body connected with lodges to sever these relations.

As to unionism, the editor of the *Lutheran* thinks the respective paragraph of the Pittsburgh Agreement condemns *indiscriminate* services. To quote him: "The Church has observed that in many instances assemblies for worship have indicated objectives which either disregard our confessional principles or seem to render the confession of them by a Lutheran indefinite or superficial. It therefore declared at Omaha that *indiscriminate* services are not permissible, and thus it drew a hard and fast line between the privileges of citizens gathering under certain circumstances for common petition or common thanksgiving or common correction of menacing evils, and meetings involving recognition of confessional principles." The editor's view evidently is that joint services with errorists are permissible except when recognition of confessional principles is involved. Everybody can see how wide the door is which is here left open for practices born of indifference in matters of doctrine. If he permits the holding of joint Thanksgiving Day services with errorists, with what sort of arguments will he convince his brethren that they must not hold joint services with heterodox people on any Sunday morning they please? The greater part of the editorial discussion is concerned with the paragraph of the Pittsburgh Agreement which treats of the doctrine of inspiration. While we believe that the editor wishes to defend the use of the word *errorless* in speaking of the Scriptures, his language is not very definite. He writes: "Attention therefore focuses on these original manuscripts. It is to them that the Pittsburgh declaration refers in its term *errorless*. It is a logical implication in view of the divine function committed to Holy Scripture that they who were called to record truths essential to salvation should be able to perform their tasks without errors. Why should they make mistakes concerning what were the conditions, situations, and events of their own times if they had had committed to them the narration of revelation? Why should the Jews for the Old Testament and the writers of the New Testament be careless about their statements of fact? There is justified allowance for errors in transcription, for inadequacies of the languages into which the Bible has been translated and especially for the 'personal equation' in interpreting the sacred books. But deduction concerning reliability is convincingly on the side of *errorless*. Indeed, the constant criticism to which it has been unsuccessfully subjected could be adduced as a correlative testimony to this same quality."

Our comment is: Certainly it is right to limit the inspiration of the Scriptures to the original manuscripts. Everybody admits that in asserting the verbal inspiration of the Bible, we are not speaking of copies that were made or translations that were produced or of interpretations that have been uttered. To state that the men who wrote the Old and the New Testament were careful in what they asserted is irrelevant. Of course, they were careful. The question is whether the Holy Spirit guided them in such a way that what they wrote became the infallible Word of God. We wish that the editor of the *Lutheran* had spoken with greater clarity and emphasis on this point.

The situation of the U. L. C. A. evidently is confused. There is a difference of opinion as to what was adopted at Omaha. That the subject is discussed in the official organ of the U. L. C. A. is a good thing. Perhaps as a result of such discussions it will become evident to the conservative members of the U. L. C. A. that a number of their leaders and teachers have definitely broken with historical Lutheranism and that stern action with respect to them is required. A.

What About Christ's Agony in Gethsemane? — In the January, 1941, issue of the *Augustana Quarterly*, pages 59—65, an article by T. A. Holmer appeared on "Our Lord's Prayer — Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane," with the following editorial comment: "Rev. T. A. Holmer is pastor of the Lebanon Lutheran Church, Du Bois, Pa. He was formerly a missionary in India. His article on Christ's agony in Gethsemane directs our attention to the meaning of suffering in general and to the mystery of a 'suffering God' in particular as we approach the season of Lent." (L. c., p. 2.)

What do we learn from this article? After rejecting a number of theories seeking to explain the mystery of Gethsemane, the author continues: "The first of two commonly accepted theories is that Jesus as our High Priest, who was tempted in all things like as we are, must be afflicted also by this fear of death, even as it afflicts us. Now it seems quite evident that the 'cup' about which Jesus prayed was His death upon the cross, that He wished to be delivered from this death, and, furthermore, that He yielded only because He must. However, if Jesus suffered this fear of death in order to be like us, what could have been the purpose of it? To make Him more sympathetic with us in our hour of death? . . .

"The second of these theories is that Jesus, the absolutely Pure and Sinless, now encountered the sum total of sin and evil as a horrible and well-nigh infinite mass, and this made Him recoil. He was the Sin-bearer, not of one individual only but of all men of all ages. It would be as if the billows of all hell in an overwhelming mass, with its foulness and guilt, rolled over Him. How utterly revolting and shocking the hellish wickedness of some one story can be! Then, besides this, complementing this experience, was Jesus' consciousness of God's crushing reaction against all sin as an absolute and consuming judgment requiring full satisfaction. All the sin and offense by all men in all ages against an infinite and holy Majesty was to be fully balanced by Jesus, suffering and dying as our Substitute. And the burden was such as to break the strength even of the Son of God.

"Each and all of these theories fail to answer serious questions arising from the facts of the case. In the first place, could Jesus, who dwelt much on the thought of His death and has tried to prepare His disciples for it, Himself have come to the Garden so unprepared for the demands of this sacrifice that, when faced with it, He totally broke down and lost self-control? Not once but three times, not one hour but three, with the bloody sweat of His soul's agony, did He supplicate His Father to take the 'cup' from Him. Certainly, that was not making the sacrifice with a spirit ready and prepared.

"Then again, the argument from the sinlessness of Jesus fails to satisfy. It may be granted that His sinlessness produced a certain spiritual delicacy or fastidiousness by reason of which He would naturally recoil from all contact with hell's slime. But, on the one hand, a person with true spiritual zeal will not be deterred by any such delicacy when there are spiritual principles at stake. From such a viewpoint, how could Jesus have taken the first step, from heaven to earth? On the other hand, Jesus had already met sin in all its vileness as He moved among men. After all, it was just this sin of man that He had to meet and deal with in His redemptive work, and the dark and awful depravity of the human heart was fully manifest to Him. To put into the picture an imagined wickedness found neither in the Bible nor in human experience serves only to create a straw-man. . . .

"The trouble with all the aforementioned theories is that they look in the wrong direction for the solution. The explanation of the Lord's agony in the Garden is not to be found in His relationship to His Father nor in His relationship to the mass of mankind's sin. The cause of His agony is found in His relationship to His people and in the realm of His love. His agony did not come from any fear of mere death, nor was it a quailing under an unspeakable pressure of God's wrath, nor was it a squeamish shrinking from the foulness of sin. In respect of these matters Jesus evinced a robustness equaled by no man. No, it was in the perfect, the heavenly, sensitiveness of His heart that He suffered torments like those of the cross.

"The truth is that Jesus was crushed by His people's heartless and blind rejection of Him and of their own salvation. It is impossible for us with our calloused sensibilities fully to appreciate what He felt. His love was perfect, more tender than a mother's love; and the attitude of His people must have given Him most poignant pain. . . . He mourned over the failure of great opportunities and promises. His soul was in travail with the woe of the people, the women and children. To Him it was an imminent and awful tragedy. He had sought to avert it, but now He faces it helplessly: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me.' But the most bitter pain was caused by the human hard-heartedness and the blindness of these people whom He loved to the end, for whom He had left heaven itself. How could they commit this heinous crime and damn their souls with such a sin! This thought utterly crushed Him. Therefore, in making this petition, Jesus was not praying for Himself but for the people; He was praying for the conversion of the people. . . .

"Not only the unbelieving and the hostile play a part in this garden tragedy; the disciples, the sleepy, misunderstanding, unresponsive, have their share in it. Jesus took them along with Him and admonished them to watch and pray with Him. They knew that He went up to Jerusalem to die. The sad consciousness of this so sapped them of strength that they fell asleep 'for sorrow.' But they utterly failed to apprehend the cause and meaning of the tragedy facing them. And it is evident that they bitterly disappointed their Lord at this crucial time. Did this failure of the disciples in discernment and prayer have a bearing on the course of events? Did it contribute to the apparent defeat which the Lord suffered?

"Had there been ten righteous, prayerfully zealous men in Sodom, the city would have been spared. In fact, Jesus intimates that He could have saved Sodom. If the disciples had been fully awake to the situation and had earnestly devoted themselves to prayer, could Gethsemane and Calvary have been averted? From this viewpoint it is easier to understand the cryptic remark of our Lord to the disciples as He faces His captors: 'Sleep on now and take your rest; it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.' In other words: 'Prayer has failed, particularly your prayer. The opportunity is past; and I will not ask any more for your effort. There is only one thing left to Me now: to go the bitter way of the cross.' . . .

"Does not the Lord have His Gethsemane tragedies today? What of Russia? What of Germany? Are they not such tragedies? And can not these tragedies be multiplied from the record of church history? Is it not true that the Christ is still being betrayed into the hands of sinners? And why? Because the Church, the blind, misunderstanding, sleepy Church, has failed to heed His admonition to watch and pray. We must realize that the Gethsemane problem is a joint matter of the Lord and His Church. As such this scene has a meaning and application for all church history."

We ask, Is that Lutheran doctrine? Is that the Biblical explanation of the agony in Gethsemane? No, says Isaiah, chap. 53:4-6. No, says Paul, 2 Cor. 5:18-21. No, says Peter, 1 Pet. 1:18, 19. No, says John, 1 John 1:7; 2:2. No, says our Savior Himself, Matt. 20:28. Christ's agony in Gethsemane, like all His suffering, was vicarious, a suffering of the agonies we had deserved. Has the *Augustana Quarterly* forgotten the a-b-c of the Christian religion?

THEO. LAETSCH

Von der deutschen evangelischen Mission. Nach den neuesten Nachrichten sind in der Südafrikanischen Union seit dem 29. Juli Superintendent Jädel sowie die Missionare Johannsmeier, Schulz, Zimmermann, und Raske in dem Camp Andalusia interniert, wo sich jetzt 13 deutsche Pastoren und Missionare und 46 katholische Missionare in Internierung befinden. Aus der Herrnhuter Mission in der Kapprovinz sind die Missionare Deth und Knöbel interniert worden, während die andern Herrnhuter Missionare in Kafferland noch an Ort und Stelle sind. Zu der geplanten Kirchenkonferenz der Herrnhuter Missionare mit ihren farbigen Gemeindevertretern in Kapland hat die Regierung die Genehmigung versagt. (Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung.)

 Book Review — Literatur

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

How Firm a Foundation. A Survey of the New Testament and the Birth and Establishment of Christianity in the Light of Archeology and Secular History. By James C. Muir. National Publishing Co., Philadelphia. 1941. 292 pages, 6×8¼.

This book is just what its subtitle says, for it offers, in 21 chapters, some of the best information, both from the Scriptures and from secular sources, on the life and times of Jesus, the Messiah, and of the early Church. Unlike most books of this type, it does not quote extensively from the Biblical text but brings its account in short form, ably summarized, with sufficient documentation for all average students of the New Testament and of the era of the early Church. Some of the finest chapters, outside of those describing the life of the Savior, which occupy most of the book, are those on the imperial and the provincial rulers of those days. The general excellence of the book is so striking that one will hardly notice minor *naevi*, as when the author says that the word *ecclesia*, meaning a "summoned assembly," is used invariably of the Christian Church in the New Testament. But compare Acts 19:41. The statement that "the Twelve became seventy" (p.126) is misleading, to say the least; for the latter formed a different group from that of the apostles. The statement (p.143) that Jesus proclaimed the "ultimate solution—a common brotherhood of men working toward the highest in human destiny, with universal devotion to Divine Will," is definitely inadequate in view of the fact that the Lord Himself states the purpose of His coming, Luke 19:10. But apart from such aberrations the book is excellent for both pastors and teachers of every type.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Theopneustia. The Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By L. Gaussen, D. D. Translated into English by David D. Scott (Glasgow). The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843 N. Wells St., Chicago, Ill. 365 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

In view of the fact that today, both grossly and subtly, the doctrine of Biblical inspiration is being assailed in nearly all church circles, true Christian believers, still professing verbal and plenary inspiration, owe a debt of gratitude to the Bible Institute Colportage Association (Moody) for presenting Gaussen's famous monograph on Biblical inspiration in a new reprint. Prof. L. Gaussen, born 1790 in Geneva, Switzerland, first served Reformed Protestantism as pastor of a church near his native city. Here he inveighed against the indifferentism and secularism of his age so frankly, firmly, and unceasingly that at last he was deposed from his office by the liberal Swiss *consistoire*. Together with Merle d'Aubigné, Gaussen thereupon founded the Evangelical Society with its conservative theological seminary for the preservation of traditional Cal-

vinistic doctrine, serving this school as professor of theology till his death in 1863, a fearless, consistent defender of the faith to the end. A brilliant preacher and a recondite scholar, he wrote a number of valuable books in defense of Holy Scripture, among which *Theopneustia*, published first in Geneva, 1840 (2d edition, 1842), proved itself the most popular, especially after it had been translated into English by Dr. D. Scott of Glasgow, Scotland. While the book suffers from the faults of all works which are reproduced by photographic process and translated from a foreign language into English (and that over half a century ago); and while the reader may not agree with every statement and would perhaps rather see at times more adequate definitions, as also perchance entire restatements, Gaussen's *Theopneustia* nevertheless remains the classic Reformed monograph on verbal and plenary inspiration, written at a time when the Bible was commonly rejected as a most faulty human work (just as it is today by Dr. Buttrick and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America), little worthy of serious study. Dealing with so many and various enemies of the Book and desiring to serve both the learned and the unlearned, Dr. Gaussen put into his book about every essential that can be said on Biblical inspiration, both positively, in stating the doctrine, and negatively, in defending it against the attacks of unbelieving critics. The basic theme which he proves is that the orthodox Christian Church has always believed in, and confessed, verbal and plenary inspiration (for which he adduces copious proof from the Church Fathers), and that, wherever men attacked Biblical inspiration, it was done by heretical opponents of the *sola gratia*, who, in the interest of their false doctrine, attacked also the *sola Scriptura*. The book is divided into seven chapters: "Definition of the Theopneustia, or Divine Inspiration"; "Scriptural Proof of the Divine Inspiration"; "Brief Didactic Sketch of the Doctrine"; "Examination of Objections"; "Examination of Evasions"; "On Sacred Criticism in the Relations It Bears to Divine Inspiration"; "Conclusion." In the fore part of the book are given an "Alphabetical Index of Contents," a "Scripture Index," and an "Analysis of the Contents of Each Chapter," the last an excellent, minute survey of the chapter contents. The print is rather fine, but since there are wide margins and good chapter divisions, the reading is not too hard on the eyes. Just a few lines to show the author's way of presenting his thoughts. He writes in the "Retrospect": "Inspiration is a fact; and that fact, if attested by God, becomes to us a dogma. But it is the Book that is inspired; it is with the Book that, above all things, we have to do, and not with the writers. We might almost dispense with believing the inspiration of the thoughts, while we could not dispense with that of the language. If the words of the Book are God's words, of what consequence to me, after all, are the thoughts of the writer? Whatever his mental qualifications, what proceeded from his hands would always be the Bible: whereas, let the thoughts be given him, and not the words, and it is not a Bible that he gives me, it is only something more than a sermon." We recommend the book to our pastors for careful study.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

The Drama of Our Religion. By Alfred Graham Baldwin. Oxford University Press. New York, London, Toronto. 253 pages, 5¼×8½. Price, \$2.50.

"Mr. Baldwin has helped hundreds of students of high-school age find answers to the many and always perplexing questions about religion," so the jacket informs us. In the introduction the author writes: "It is hoped that parents who want to give their children an understanding of the Bible that is consistent with the thought of our times will find this book helpful. It may suggest to them new and meaningful ways of interpreting old and familiar passages and stories." (P. X.) Note the word "suggest." In the foreword Baldwin tells us: "Education in the field of religious thought has too often been dominated by the effort to impose a point of view or inculcate a set of beliefs. This has been unfortunate because such an approach has antagonized many intelligent students and has retarded the development of religious thinking. The material included in this study is both descriptive and interpretative. It is, of course, the point of view and approach of one person and should be evaluated as such; for indoctrination of ideas and beliefs is not the aim." (P. V.) Yet, though the author seems to be horrified at the idea of an "indoctrination of ideas and beliefs," though he merely "suggests," his manner of presenting his "views" is so suggestive and his "approach" so cocksure that one cannot see the difference between the "suggestions" of the author and the "efforts to impose a point of view or inculcate a set of beliefs" he finds so dangerous. Listen to him: "The early books of the Bible should not be taken at their face value.... The first few stories of the Bible are mythical and allegorical." (P. 33.) "The attributing of the various plagues to the direct intervention of a god offers difficulty to any one whose knowledge of modern science gives him a different concept of cause and effect. But we must remember that these stories were not written in a scientific era." (P. 49.) Regarding the Carmel scene, 1 Kings 18, the author informs us: "To interpret this story literally is to miss its point and lose its meaning." (P. 85.) In the time of Elisha, "Jehovah was at this stage in Hebrew thought a tribal God and a territorial one." (P. 87.) On the baptism of Jesus we read: "There is ample justification for feeling that Jesus went to be baptized by John because he agreed essentially with what the prophet had to say, because he wanted to dedicate himself publicly to this cause, and because his own inherent humility of spirit made him feel the need for repentance. Is it too much to believe that this man who taught others to pray for forgiveness felt at times that he himself had fallen short of his ideal? Any other interpretation of this act of consecration, demanded by John of those who came to him, seems to suggest an insincerity in Jesus that is alien to his character." (Pp. 179, 180.) Concerning the gospels he writes: "We wish that they were free of all possible bias and error, but like all great works of literature these gospels leave us with questions that can never be completely answered." (P. 244.) St. John's gospel "is far more philosophical and is evidently an effort to weave together Greek thought and the Christian message." (P. 245.)

Suggestions? Points of view? Opinions? Certainly. And all with-

out the slightest foundation in fact; yet any one who will not take kindly to them lacks "knowledge of modern science," forgets that the authors of the Bible were "living in a prescientific era" (p. 234), "fails to read the Bible intelligently" (pp. 240, 246), suffers from "literal-mindedness and lack of imagination" (p. 132). "Indoctrination of ideas and beliefs"? Nothing is farther removed from the mind of the author. But if you still cling to your old-fashioned view of the Bible and Jesus, if you persist to remain so unscientific, well, that is just too bad for you!

The author boasts of being scientific, yet not one of his arguments has a foot to stand on. He deliberately changes the records to suit his imagination or omits altogether certain indisputable facts narrated in the Bible. The period of the patriarchs is summarized in the following words: "Under strong leadership a band of nomads forced their way into a strip of land that was being fought over by many tribes. Against great obstacles they maintained a hold in this territory and increased in numbers and in strength." (Pp. 42, 43.) These are called important facts; yet we have rarely met with a more thoroughgoing perversion of facts. The author evidently knows how to use his imagination in reading the Bible. But is that a scientific approach? He ignores the greatest fact of history, the resurrection of Christ. Christ died.

The author speaks of new ways suggested by him of interpreting old passages. His is, however, not a new interpretation. His are the age-old, oft-times refuted arguments of unbelief dressed up in modern form. There is not an argument which has not been advanced before by such men as Wellhausen, De Wette, Ingersoll, Paine, the old pagan philosophers. And the author uses the same age-old, unfair methods of misrepresenting the position of Bible believers so often used by enemies of the Christian religion. Only one example: "In 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee, a dramatic conflict occurred between a group who wanted science free to teach what it had discovered, and another group who wanted to safeguard certain religious beliefs. This was the so-called 'Monkey Trial,' and it aroused popular interest throughout the Western world. At this trial Clarence Darrow and Henry Fairfield Osborne spoke in defense of the theory of evolution. William Jennings Bryan spoke against it, claiming that such a hypothesis could not be true unless the Bible contained it. Since the Bible said nothing about evolution the theory must be false." (Pp. 11, 12.)

Bryan was not guilty of such silly twaddle. It seems that unbelief does not shrink from gross misrepresentation if that serves its purpose. Why should unbelief be afraid to garble the words of man if it does not fear to falsify the word of the living God? Ingersoll openly professed his agnosticism; modern unbelief chooses to call itself a "new meaningful way of interpreting old and familiar passages and stories." Is that honest?

TH. LAETSCH

Medical Work of the Knights Hospitalers of Saint John of Jerusalem.

By Edgar Erskine Hume, Lieutenant-Colonel, Medical Corps, United States Army. The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. 371 pages. Price, \$3.00.

Material for the study of the great spiritual orders organized in connection with the Crusades is not plentiful. The present volume, a pub-

lication of the Institute of the History of Medicine of the Johns Hopkins University, is therefore a welcome addition, sketching the history of the Knights of St. John from the time of the founding of the order between 1048 and 1070, through their activity during the Crusades, their removal to the Island of Rhodes in 1306, to Malta in 1530, to the present time; for this is the only one of the three great orders still in existence; the Knights Templars were suppressed in 1312 and the Teutonic Knights dissolved in 1525. — The title speaks of the medical work of the Knights; it is nevertheless a history of the order, for that was the object of the order, to care for "our lords the sick." They were the ancestors of the Red Cross, the first to provide organized medical care on the battle-field. The author has gleaned many interesting particulars from widely scattered documents. Already at the time of the Crusades (ca. 1160) the order had in Jerusalem a hospital accommodating 2,000 patients. There is at that time the first reference in history to beds being provided for patients. The Knights provided a bed for each patient; did not crowd two or three into one bed, as was the custom. The Knights were the leaders in the study of anatomy, for which purpose the bodies of all the Knights were used. — 130 interesting pictures are included; one of them the "first photograph" of a mummified hand, alleged to be the "hand that baptized Jesus," the right hand of John the Baptist. While that picture does not exactly arouse us to ecstasy, as it does the present (the 76th) Grand Master of the order, Prince Ludovico Chigi-Albani Della Rovere, still it is interesting. — At times the religious connection of the order is evident in the shade of an account; sometimes it interferes a little with historic accuracy. The suppression of the Templars is passed over in two sentences; the reason given is the demoralization of the order — which is by no means certain; and the statement that their whole property was transferred to the Hospitalers is the truth — but not the whole truth! That was indeed the order given when (presumably on the basis of a preelection understanding between Philip IV of France and Pope Clement V) the order was dissolved; but Philip and the Pope had already confiscated their share of the order's possession when that order was promulgated!

THEO. HOYER

How to Discuss the Story. Junior I (515 pages) and Intermediate I (550 pages), $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. By M. Reu. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. Price: Each \$2.00.

In these volumes, which here appear in a revised edition, Dr. Reu shows how Bible-stories may be effectively told with an interweaving of the necessary explanatory remarks and appropriate applications. The stories treated in these two volumes are the same. There are 52 chapters, one for every Sunday. Periodically, approximately after a series of five chapters, a review chapter occurs, the respective Sunday's lesson being devoted to a review of the series. The church-year is followed in the selection of the stories. For the time before Pentecost most of the selections are taken from the New Testament. For the Trinity Sundays the material is largely taken from the Book of Genesis. The arrangement of the chapters is simple. In the first place, the Scripture-passages in which the story to be discussed is found are indicated. Next follows

a section which has the heading "Explanatory Remarks." In the third place, there is a reference to another work by Dr. Reu, having the title "How I Tell." The fourth and last section is entitled "Discussion of the Story." Naturally the second and the fourth sections really give us the contents of these books, the first and third being merely formal. We have read a number of the chapters with pleasure and satisfaction. The explanatory remarks are pertinent and help one to understand the narrative. In the section called "Discussion of the Story" we have chiefly questions to be asked by the teacher, to which, wherever necessary, further explanatory remarks are added. The treatment of the Bible-stories is characterized by reverence and simplicity of style. To give the readers an idea of the method followed, we at random quote a few sentences from the chapter entitled "How Jesus Healed the Man Sick of the Palsy Both in Body and Soul" (15—First Sunday in Lent). In the volume called *Intermediate I* (p. 137) these helpful comments are found in the "Explanatory Remarks": "To understand this story rightly, one must know how houses used at that time were built. Each house consisted of a long quadrangle with a flat roof, just as most of our shops are built even today. Usually they had only one story; hence in the cool of the evening the family often repaired to the roof. Thither men also retired to pray (2 Kings 23:12; Jer. 19:13; Acts 10:9). Booths were often erected on housetops for the Feast of Tabernacles. The house itself consisted of two or three rooms. Upon entering, one came first into the forecourt, that is, into a large room, which was shut off from the outside by walls, but was only partly covered by a roof. From the forecourt a door led into the living-room, from which one usually could pass into the adjacent inner rooms. The living-room received its light from two windows, which did not open toward the street nor toward the interior court, but upon the forecourt. Windows usually consisted of latticed openings in the walls. The living-room, as well as both inner rooms, was covered with a flat roof, which was supported by heavy beams and consisted of two layers, the lower one consisting of joists of wood covered with brushwood, the upper one usually of clay or mud mixed with chopped straw, which was beaten or trodden down until it was solid and then kept rain-proof by means of a stone roller. At times the upper layer was made of tiles specially prepared for the purpose (Luke 5:19). From the forecourt, which was paved, steps or a regular staircase led to the roof." In the fourth section ("Discussion of the Story," p. 143) these are the sentences pertaining to the explanatory remarks just submitted: "Who will describe a Jewish house of that period? I shall draw a plan of a Jewish house on the board. Here you see that it consisted in a long rectangle. Into how many parts was it separated? The large room in front we call the forecourt. A door led from the street into this forecourt. Here were the walls, the floor was paved with clay or tile, the roof covered only a part of the space enclosed by these walls; from the rest of it one could see the blue sky above. What name shall we give the second room? How did it receive light? What was adjacent to the living-room? How did one reach the roof? What do you know about the roof and how it was built? For

what was the roof used?" Etc. These excerpts will give the reader an idea of the helpfulness of these volumes and show how well adapted they are for use by our Sunday-school teachers as they prepare for their blessed work.

W. ARNDT

Preaching from the Bible. By Andrew W. Blackwood. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 247 pages, 8×5½. Price, \$2.00.

Why this book appeals to me and why I recommend it to our preachers is expressed in the last sentence of the author's foreword and in the opening sentence of his first chapter. These sentences read: "The Bible should ever be our supreme book about preaching, and the Holy Spirit should be our Teacher." (Foreword, p.9.) "The theory which undergirds this book is that the Bible should be the basis of the minister's pulpit work." (15.)

Professor Blackwood, an instructor in homiletics at the Princeton Theological Seminary, has given us a book on the art of preaching written along unusual lines. A preacher, he says, must know his Bible, the needs of his people, and how to preach. A preacher ought to be eager to lay his hands on any book that will help him to improve his pulpit work. Doing so, he will not come under the condemnation of the preacher of whom the chairman of a committee in quest of a pastor said, as quoted in the foreword by Professor Blackwood, "Our people loved our former minister, but they soon grew weary of his sermons. Every year, after the first few weeks in the fall, he seemed to be all preached out." (7.) In a recent article in one of the magazines it is said that millions of people are turning to various religious cults and are cheerfully paying their money for what is offered them because the churches have failed to offer them soul-satisfying spiritual food. A church which preaches the Bible will not come under such a terrible indictment. But let us not lose sight of the fact that preaching may be Biblical, and yet the preacher may not be able to say with Paul, "I have not shunned to declare unto you *all the counsel of God.*"

J. H. C. FRITZ

Have You Met These Women? By Harold John Ockenga. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 146 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.00.

The author, a Presbyterian, the pastor of Park Street Church, Boston, Mass., has written a number of books from the fundamentalist viewpoint. He is a firm believer in the plenary inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, and the vicarious atonement. It is one of the few books published in recent times that correctly interprets Gen. 1:4 as the confession of Eve that she has "gotten a man, the Lord." There are many other passages of great beauty and many practical applications of well-known texts. Unfortunately the author's statements are not always reliable, not only not where his Reformed viewpoint causes him to deviate from Scripture. What shall we make of a passage like this: "True, those sufferings were substitutionary. He was the lonely Sufferer, the One suffering for the many. It was a sufficient atonement. It was One suffering for all, universal in kind. It was efficacious. He will save those for whom He died" (p.145) or of his

theory that the six days are six periods of indefinite length (pp. 80, 81)? The author, however, errs also in linguistic explanations and historical facts. There is not the remotest connection between the name Jah or Jehovah and the names of Abram changed into Abraham and of Sarai changed into Sarah (p. 38). There is no evidence of that "very heart-breaking scene between these two lowly lovers of Nazareth, Joseph kindly but firmly making an accusation and wrongfully deciding that he could never have Mary as his wife, hurt though this terrible fact did. We may assume that it was on account of this that Mary took her trip to Elisabeth in the hill country of Judah" (p. 138). Similar unwarranted assumptions are found throughout the book. The doctrine of the immaculate conception was not pronounced in 1879 (p. 135) but on December 8, 1854. The old pagan enemy of Christianity was Celsus and not Celcus (so twice on p. 137). The word for create is *bara*, not *barak* (p. 82). — Any one able to select the wheat from such chaff may find the book usable.

TH. LAETSCH

Lutheran Book of Prayer. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 214 pages, 5¾×4. Price: Paper covers, 30 cts.; cloth covers, 50 cts.; cloth, gilt edges, 85 cts.; leather covers, \$1.75. Special zipper carrying case, black or white, \$1.00.

A new little book of prayers to meet present conditions and needs has been put on the market by our Publishing House. It contains four sets of prayers for every day of the week, prayers for church holidays, prayers pertaining to church and worship, to national affairs, and for special occasions in the family circle; also prayers at table, selected psalms, the Nicene Creed, the general confession of sins, and Luther's Small Catechism. It is quite complete and well done. Pastors should call the attention of their members to this new prayer-book and urge them to use it daily. Prayer is a great Christian privilege. Let us encourage its use.

J. H. C. FRITZ

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

Life Everlasting. Our Hope of the Resurrection. Daily Devotions, April 14 to June 1, 1941. No. 31. By R. T. Du Brau. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 63 pages. Price, 5 cts. per copy, postpaid; 48 cts. per dozen, postage extra; \$3.00 per hundred, postage extra.

Gottes Bruennlein. Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 14. April, Ostermontag, bis zum 1. Juni, Pfingsten, 1941. By Friedrich A. Hertwig. Same price as above.

The Seminary Edition of Choruses and Quartets, Classical and Modern, for Male Voices. No. 20: "Why, My Soul, Art Thou So Vexed?" Ps. 42:6. By Mendelssohn-Mertz. 2 pages. Price, 10 cts. — No. 21: "Glory to God." By Stein-Mertz. 6 pages. Price, 20 cts. — No. 22: "Behold the Lamb of God." By Weeber-Mertz. 4 pages. Price, 15 cts. — No. 23: "In Thee, O Lord, My Trusting Soul Reposes." By Klein-Mertz. 3 pages. Price, 10 cts.

From Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, N. Y.:

What God Says. By Joseph Addison Richards. 96 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.